JUN 16 1961

THE HISTORICAL JESUS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THÉOLOGIE DE L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT. 1 vol. (This book has been translated into English by Prof. H. G. Mitchell, of Boston University.)

HISTOIRE DU PEUPLE D'ISRAEL. 1 vol.

JÉSUS ET LES APÔTRES. 1 vol.

LA CHRISTOLOGIE BIBLIQUE ET SES ORIGINES. 1 vol.

THE HISTORICAL JESUS

BY

CHARLES PIEPENBRING, TH.D.

TRANSLATED BY

LILIAN A. CLARE

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BT
301
.P63
1924
51,757

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1924

232
P

(*All rights reserved*)

Printed in Great Britain by
UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, LONDON AND WOKING

PREFACE

In his noteworthy Commentary on the Gospels the eminent Professor Loisy showed considerable acumen in differentiating the parts of these Biblical documents which are most historic and authentic from the rest. It seemed to us, however, that his estimate of the personality and the teaching of Jesus left several things out of account ; that, to some extent at least, he failed to recognize the nobler and more permanent side of them. This reason induced us to publish our first treatise on *Jésus Historique*, in which, while accepting the chief critical and literary findings of the Commentary mentioned, we tried to fill in the gaps we have indicated.

Since the first edition of that pamphlet is now exhausted, and we have moreover continued our research into a matter which is of such vital importance to Christianity, we here present to the public a treatise on the subject which is entirely fresh and much more complete than the earlier one. We do not again set forth the literary basis of the subject in detail as we did then, however ; we have condensed this aspect of it in a brief appendix, since it does not

JUN 16 1961

interest all readers alike. Anyone who desires at the outset to get a clear idea of our views upon the criticism of the Gospels and our opinion as to which parts of them are the most authentic, and form our chief sources of information, will naturally begin by a careful study of this appendix, or better still, of the earlier brochure.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 5

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE 9

CHAPTER

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION 11

1. Jesus Prior to His Ministry . . . 11
2. Jesus and John the Baptist . . . 16
3. Jesus and the Old Testament . . . 22
4. The Ministry of Jesus 30

II. THE KINGDOM OF GOD 41

1. The Eschatological Nature of the Kingdom of God 41
2. Other Characteristics of the Kingdom of God 47
3. Modifications of the Idea of the Kingdom of God 55

III. THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION 63

1. Conversion and a New Life . . . 63
2. Sin and Faith 70
3. Eudæmonism and Jesus' Ideal . . . 76

IV. THE GOD OF THE GOSPELS 83

1. The Teaching of Jesus 83
2. The Consequences of His Teaching . . 91

CHAPTER PAGE

V. A New Phase in Jesus' Ministry . . . 98
1. The Hostility of the Jews and Goodwill of Others 98
2. The Feeding of the Multitudes and the Scene at Cæsarea Philippi 105
3. Jesus' Messiahship 110
4. The Messianic Titles 117
5. The Predictions of Jesus' Death and Resurrection 128

VI. The Last Phase of Jesus' Ministry . . 135
1. Chronological Points and Other General Considerations 135
2. Jesus' Activities in Jerusalem . . . 141

VII. Jesus' Passion and Resurrection . . . 154
1. The Betrayal and the Lord's Supper . 154
2. Jesus Crucified and Glorified . . . 164

VIII. Conclusions 172
1. The Superlative Value of Jesus' Gospel. Jesus and Laotze 172
2. The Superiority of Christianity. The Stoic Ideals 188

Appendix 207
1. The Gospels in General 207
2. The Primitive Elements of the Gospels . 212

Bibliography 221

Index 223

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

THE author of this book, Dr. Charles Piepenbring, who was born in 1840 in the Alsatian village of Mittelbergheim, was not primarily destined for a pastoral career. When, however, he arrived in Paris in 1863 and became a member of the Young Men's Christian Association there, his friends in the Society urged him thereto, and he followed their advice by becoming a student at the Paris-Batignolles Theological School. Here he prepared for his Bachelor of Arts degree, which he acquired in 1868. He continued his studies at the Faculté de Théologie at Strasburg, and there became acquainted with Tomy Fallot, who was also studying theology, after having made his start in industrial life in his native village of Fouday. It was through the influence of his friend that the pastoral charge of that locality (formerly attached to the parish of Oberlin) was offered him, the vacancy occurring just as M. Piepenbring was concluding his theological course. He occupied the position of pastor there until March 1880, when he became French pastor of the Reformed Church of Strasburg. In 1883 he was elected President of the Reformed Church Council of that city, and held this post until 1913. Dr. Piepenbring helped largely in the formation of the Reformed Synod of Alsace-Lorraine; he was its first secretary, and from 1898 until 1913 he occupied the Presidential chair. He was superannuated in September 1914, and from that date he has taken no active part in pastoral duties.

Throughout his busy life, Dr. Piepenbring contrived to find time for the prosecution of theological research. In 1886 he published his *Théologie de L'Ancien Testament*, which was shortly afterwards translated into English and appeared in the United States. It attracted the

attention of the Directorate of the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, and from that time forward he became a contributor to the Review. Its outlook on the religions of the world enlarged the author's horizon, and led him to an extended study of their development, the results of which were set forth in the articles published from time to time in the Journal, and in his book *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, which appeared in 1898.

After special research into Early Christian religious tenets, side by side with those of the Old Testament, Dr. Piepenbring published the first edition of his *Jésus Historique*. It was undertaken with a view of amending certain aspects of Professor Loisy's estimate which did not appear to recognize sufficiently the superlative and permanent value of the personality and teaching of Jesus. The question of reconciling this teaching with the Pauline doctrine being at that time very much debated, the theologian was induced to bring out in 1911 his *Jésus et les Apôtres*, in which he sought to establish the fact that important differences do actually exist between the authentic teaching of Jesus, on the one hand, and Jewish Christianity and Paulinism, on the other. After his retirement, while the world-war was raging, Dr. Piepenbring elaborated his study of Biblical Christology, and his *Christologie Biblique et ses Origines*, after appearing in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, was published in book form, with an extensive preface. In it he set forth the need for fresh religious reform, the Churches of the day having proved themselves incapable of so influencing the morals of Christian nations as to make an inhuman scourge like war impossible. When the first edition of *Jésus Historique* was exhausted, its author proceeded to bring out a second, which is much more comprehensive and entirely fresh, the existing literature on the subject having been placed under contribution more freely than in the earlier brochure. Its final chapter, indeed, is devoted to the important question of religious syncretism in general, and thus the scope of the present book is more extensive than that of its predecessor, while the same spirit animates them both.

THE HISTORICAL JESUS

CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. Jesus Prior to His Ministry.

Although the Gospel story, properly so called, does not go back farther than the ministry of John the Baptist, certain facts relating to the childhood and youth of Jesus are known to us, and of these the most authentic and the most interesting are the following.[1]

Jesus' parents, Joseph and Mary, were very devout people. They brought Him up in the principles of Judaism then prevailing among the masses in Palestine. They lived at Nazareth, a Galilean village, and in addition to Jesus they had four other sons and at least two daughters.[2] At a very early age Jesus became acquainted with the most beautiful stories in the Old Testament, related to Him by His parents. From His tenth to His twelfth year He frequented the village school, where His instruction was carried

[1] The best French book dealing with this subject is Staffer's Jésus avant son ministère. Cf. Renan, Vie de Jésus, 13th ed. ch. ii-iv; Keim, i. pp. 307-573; O. Holtzmann, Leben Jesu, ch. iv-vi; H. Holtzmann, Theologie, 2nd ed., i, pp. 159-75.

[2] Mark vi, 3.

further; there He learned reading, writing and arithmetic. At twelve He became subject to the ordinances of the Law, and henceforward it was His duty to recite, night and morning, the *Shema*, which consisted of Deuteronomy vi, 4–9, xi, 13–21, and Numbers xv, 37–41. These passages from the Bible will have formed the main theme of His early religious meditations. To them we must add that which He learned each Sabbath in the services of the Synagogue. Brought up in a pious family circle, He undoubtedly believed all that a young Israelite of His time would believe, and practised the same religious observances.

His father was a journeyman carpenter by trade. Jesus learned carpentry in His father's house, and practised His calling until His ministry began. Joseph's death must have taken place while Jesus was still young, for at the time of His ministry there is no mention of His father. For many years then, Jesus, being the eldest of the family, worked with His hands to maintain His relatives and supply the place of the dead father, hence He is spoken of both as a carpenter and as the son of a carpenter. To judge from His later life He must at all times have been very helpful, kind, loving and compassionate, devoting His leisure moments to prayer and meditation. He had unusual powers of observation and reflection, enabling Him readily to assimilate all that He saw and heard, and derive from it practical conclusions of the most varied kind. This is seen in His numerous parables, which are real masterpieces, both as to form and essence.

It was thus that He trained and developed His mind, for He never attended any advanced school, or His wisdom would not have created such surprise

as it did.[1] He profited moreover by all the other educational advantages that Nazareth afforded. He was a regular attendant at the Synagogue services. After their worship, the men of the place used to gather together for the purpose of reading and meditating upon the Scriptures. The Rabbis, who were very zealous in disseminating the knowledge of the Law, were accustomed to participate in these private gatherings as well as in the public worship. Jesus must have been eager to profit by every opportunity of making progress in religious knowledge and all forms of piety. At the chief festivals, especially the Passover Feast, He would not fail to go to Jerusalem, and there, with other devout pilgrims, He would take part in the Temple services, and He must have profited considerably from His sojourns there, learning, in the synagogues of the capital, from those who were the most distinguished teachers of their day.

His reading, too, was one of His sources of instruction. We may even conjecture which books Jesus knew best and loved most to meditate upon. He would first become conversant with the Law or the Pentateuch, for the Jews considered it the most important, and a portion of it was read and expounded every Sabbath in the Synagogue. It is natural that in His early years He should simply accept what His parents and instructors taught Him, but later He adopted personal views and in many respects followed His own line of thought, as His ministry will show. Besides the Law, Jesus made a special study of the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and Daniel, and the collection of Psalms which formed the canticles of the Synagogue services. Certain Apocalypses

[1] Mark vi, 2.

which do not form part of Holy Writ must also have been read by Him. All this would be amply sufficient for His instruction and general intellectual development, for His was an autodidactic mind of the highest order.

Jesus' teaching not only allows us to conjecture with some degree of probability which of the Biblical books He was accustomed to read in His youth, but also the spirit in which He read them and the conclusions He drew from their perusal. God's rule as King, so much emphasized in the Jewish Sacred Code, was so strongly impressed upon His mind as to be the main object and central idea of all His preaching. Moreover, this Kingship presented itself to Him in a most encouraging light, for He was not only strongly affected by the sacred majesty of God, but also, and above all, by His condescension and goodness. The psalms which extol in such laudatory terms the Divine Providence watching over and caring for all created beings, made a profound impression upon Jesus, and afterwards wrung from Him His most touching words. He readily grasped a whole side of the Biblical teaching never realized by the apostle Paul, Luther, and many other thinkers. This is to be found in such statements as those of Psalm ciii, referring to the lovingkindness and compassion shown by God to sinful and penitent man.

From all this it is evident that for some years Jesus acquiesced in the Pharisaic influence at that time dominating the Jewish people, especially in the synagogues. Most of the really devout Jews ranged themselves on the side of the Pharisees, and even during His ministry Jesus maintained relations with them. Moreover, one aspect of their teaching would

have been pleasing to Jesus, for to some extent their partiality for the synagogue worship (which consisted of prayers, hymns, Biblical readings and expositions) would be spiritualizing Judaism. Such worship was infinitely superior to that of the Temple with its sacrifices and excessively formal sacerdotal ritual, making no appeal, or scarcely any, to the heart and conscience, the intelligence and the will. Jesus felt further removed from the Sadducean priests than from the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees, who held the love of God and man to be more important than the offering of sacrifices, and laid stress upon the obligation to lead a holy and just life in order to please God and obtain His blessings. He adopted the fundamental belief of the Pharisees—the belief in the resurrection of the dead. All this proves that Jesus' mind was by no means narrow, but that He accepted whatever was good, wherever He might find it.

It has frequently been asserted that He was also influenced by the doctrines of the Essenes. It is quite possible, for the Essenes were to be found not only in the monasteries of the oasis of Engedi, but scattered throughout Palestine. Their chief concern was purity of life. They systematically refrained from politics, and attached little importance to the worship of the Temple. Although both active and devoted, they loved prayer and meditation. They sought out the sick and the poor. They troubled very little about the needs of the morrow, and for their livelihood depended upon the alms given them. In the houses of those they visited they reckoned upon finding brothers who would provide for their simple needs. Many of them renounced marriage, the better

to devote themselves to their work; they occupied their days in preaching and in tending the sick. They never took oaths, and forbade their disciples to do so. One of their fundamental doctrines was the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God. According to them, the advent of the Messianic era should be hastened by the sale of earthly possessions and the gift of the proceeds to the poor. All this would please Jesus and inspire in Him sympathy with the Essenes.

But just as during His ministry He fiercely combated the evils of Pharisaism, so too He entered upon a course in some respects diametrically opposed to the monastic views and asceticism of the Essenes. They carried Levitical purification to extremes, whilst Jesus attached no importance to it. They deemed themselves defiled by the slightest contact even with an Essene, if he belonged to a lower class or category than their own, whilst He was accustomed to hold free intercourse with publicans and sinners, even going so far as to eat with them. If Jesus was influenced by the Essene doctrines as well as by those of the Pharisees, it is clear that He was far from simply copying either, but that He took an independent standpoint with regard to them, preserving His originality and following His own course, because He had conceived a nobler ideal.

2. Jesus and John the Baptist.

It is with John the Baptist's ministry that the original and authentic Gospel story opens. His ministry, however, is related but very briefly, because it simply forms an introduction to that of Jesus.

John's activities were chiefly exercised in the wild and barren district in which the Jordan is about to fall into the Dead Sea.[1] Such a region was well suited to John's austerity, an austerity which he enjoined upon his disciples likewise.[2] The shallow Jordan readily lent itself to the rite of baptism which John administered to all who were moved by his preaching and who, repenting of their sins, made public confession thereof.[3] This baptism by immersion was a symbol of the cleansing of the heart and consecration of the life, following up an idea which we already find outlined in the Old Testament.[4] Cleansings and ablutions were prescribed by the Law for a variety of occasions; the Pharisees had further extended their use; the baptism of converts betokened that they were purged of their pagan errors; and finally, the Essenes, who carried purifying rites to the highest point, were accustomed to bathe daily.[5] John's baptism was possibly also a bond of association and of community in religion.[6]

The impression produced by John was so deep, and spread so rapidly that vast crowds were attracted to him.[7] The people in general considered him a prophet.[8] The publicans and sinners—not the scribes and Pharisees[9]—profited most by his ministry. It

[1] Mark i, 4; Matt. iii, 1. 5; xi, 7; Luke i, 80; iii, 2–3; vii, 24.
[2] Mark i, 6; ii, 18; Matt. xi, 8–18; Luke vii, 25, 33.
[3] Mark i, 4–5; Matt. iii, 6, 11; Luke iii, 16.
[4] Is. i, 16; iv, 4; Jer. ii, 22; iv, 14; Ezek. xxxvi, 25; Mic. viii, 19; Ps. li, 4, 9.
[5] Keim, i, pp. 500 et seq.; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 393.
[6] Keim, i, p. 503; Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, i, pp. 323-9; Sabatier, Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses, vii, pp. 168–9.
[7] Mark i, 5.
[8] Mark xi, 32.
[9] Luke vii, 29–30; Matt. xxi, 32.

was the latter, no doubt, who accused Him of being possessed of a devil.[1]

The guiding force of John's ministry was the conviction that the Kingdom of God was close at hand, and that the Messiah would pronounce a severe sentence upon unbelievers.[2] This was why the Baptist so insistently warned his hearers to flee from the Divine wrath about to burst forth and smite impenitent sinners.[3] He declared that it was not enough to be descendants of Abraham to escape the judgment; they must bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, forsaking evil and scrupulously practising all the virtues.[4]

For a long time past the Jews, in times of great national distress, had been wont to believe that the Messianic reign would be inaugurated to put an end to their troubles. Now at the time of John the Baptist this distress was so severe that it seemed absolutely to demand Divine intervention.[5] The generality of Jews, however, believed that the judgment would fall upon heathen nations alone, and to themselves, as descendants of Abraham, it would be the moment of deliverance and salvation, but John, rising to a loftier point of view, announced that judgment would fall on all sinners indiscriminately, and especially upon his Jewish hearers, as the prophet Amos and others had already foretold; hence the great religious and moral importance of his preaching.

[1] Matt. xi, 18; Luke vii, 33. Cf. Mark iii, 22–30, and parallel passages.

[2] Matt. iii, 2, 11–12; Luke iii, 16–17; Mark i, 7–8.

[3] Luke iii, 7–9; Matt iii, 7, 10.

[4] Mark i, 4; Matt. iii, 8–9; Luke iii, 8, 10–14.

[5] Keim, i, pp. 487–90.

In another respect John followed in the footsteps of the most spiritual of the older prophets, who regarded the practice of virtue as above outward observance. To him the fundamental condition of salvation was the change of heart and life of which baptism was the symbol. Unlike other Jewish teachers, he neither strayed into the field of transcendental speculations nor lost himself in the exaggerated ritualism of popular Judaism. According to his view the Messiah would definitely separate the good, destined to be saved, from the bad, doomed to perdition.[1] The simplicity of this idea would be sure to create a profound impression and exercise a salutary influence upon the hearts of his hearers, leading them to that serious repentance which, as we have seen, was the condition essential to salvation.

John, again, was to be distinguished, and advantageously so, from the Jewish zealots who were desirous of bringing about the Kingdom of God with violence by political and revolutionary measures. He, on the contrary, demanded nothing save, side by side with repentance, the faithful fulfilment of God's will, which is implied in the statement that men must resemble the tree bringing forth good fruits, the fruits of all the virtues.[2] This twofold condition being fulfilled, John assured his hearers that God would Himself establish His Kingdom on earth and, as we shall see, Jesus takes the same attitude.

Our Lord, recognizing the Baptist's superiority, raised him above all prophets and men of God of

[1] Matt. iii, 12 ; Luke iii, 17.
[2] Matt. iii, 8, 10 ; Luke iii, 8–9.

past ages, while yet declaring him to be inferior to the most insignificant members of the Kingdom of God.[1] He even saw in Him the second Elias, destined to bear witness to the coming of the Kingdom of God.[2] John's comparative inferiority, which prevented him from attaining to the Gospel level, arose from the fact that he fasted and made his disciples fast also, while Jesus attached little or no importance to such ascetic practices.[3] Then, too, his God was still the wrathful God of the Old Covenant, pitiless in His anger towards impenitent sinners, and without compassion for reprobates. Finally, in his eyes the Messiah was but a severe judge.[4] In all these respects the legalist point of view of the Old Testament has not been superseded yet.

Jesus' eulogistic expressions concerning John the Baptist suffice to prove how much He appreciated the latter's ministry. Delighting in the prophetical books from His early youth, He would feel drawn to John, who in so many points recalled the seers of former ages. He must have spent some time in his company, for He was intimately acquainted with the ascetic practices of His forerunner and all that related to his ministry ; He maintained intercourse with him and his disciples ; He did not begin His own ministry until after John's imprisonment, and at first He reproduced the essential points of his preaching.[5]

The best proof that Jesus fully recognized John's

[1] Matt. xi, 7–12 ; Luke vii, 24–8.
[2] Mark ix, 11–13 ; Matt. xi, 10, 14 ; Luke vii, 27.
[3] Mark ii, 18–22 ; Matt. xi, 18–19 ; Luke vii, 33–4.
[4] Matt. iii, 12 ; Luke iii, 17.
[5] Mark i, 14–15 ; ix, 13 ; Matt. iv, 12, 17 ; xi, 2, 18 ; Luke vii, 18 et seq., 33.

authority is that He sought baptism at his hands.[1] This fact is all the more incontrovertible since the Church would certainly not have invented such a circumstance. It was, in fact, the cause of a good deal of difficulty, as may be seen in the first Gospel.[2] The difficulty proceeds from the later Christological dogma, by no means easy to reconcile with the baptism of Jesus. But instead of starting from that point we should rather let ourselves be guided by Jesus' own words, in which He does not accept the qualification of "good", reserving that, in its absolute sense, for God alone.[3] We must accept Jesus' human nature in its entirety and recognize that He was "in all points like as we are"[4], with the exception of all gross sin ; we should rather conceive of Jesus' saintliness as being essentially human and progressive,[5] not a holiness beyond temptation,[6] but obtained and maintained by prayer and conflict.[7]

Then we must remember that Jesus felt profound respect for John the Baptist, placing him above the greatest men of God, even when He had admitted his comparative inferiority, as we have already seen. Possibly the lowly Jesus,[8] on approaching the Baptist, at first perceived only the brilliant and superior aspect of the great prophet. To Him, at any rate, John's baptism was of Divine origin,[9] and so it remained. He could therefore submit to the rite

[1] Mark i, 9. This fact seems to be established, but the special circumstances connected with it have been suggested to the Evangelist by Christian baptism and Jesus' Messiahship : Loisy, on Mark i, 9–11.

[2] Matt. iii, 14. Cf. Keim, i, p. 529 et seq. ; Hase, p. 295 et seq.

[3] Mark x, 18.

[4] Heb. ii, 17

[5] Luke ii, 52.

[6] Heb. ii, 18 ; iv, 15.

[7] Matt. iv, 1–11 ; Luke iv, 1–12 ; Mark xiv, 32 et seq.

[8] Matt. xi, 29.

[9] Mark xi, 30.

without having to repent of sins to the same extent as others. It has been directly affirmed: "Jesus excepted no one from the duty of repentance. He Himself was not excepted, since He desired to receive at John's hands the baptism for repentance."[1] The distance between His comparative goodness and holiness and the Divine perfection was moreover great enough to lead Him to humble Himself before the sacred majesty of God; for the loftier the soul's moral ideal, such as that of Jesus would be, the greater will that distance appear.

Besides, if He had no actual life of sin to renounce, He had nevertheless to break with a past principally concerned with the mundane affairs connected with His earlier condition and calling. He believed therefore that it was His duty, through the ceremony of baptism, faithfully to adhere to the work of regeneration to which John incited his hearers—a work which would be a response to the expectation of the speedy advent of the Kingdom of God. He even felt it His duty to abandon His calling as a carpenter, so that He too might announce this advent. How then could He despise or neglect a rite which was like a consecration to that sacred mission?

3. Jesus and the Old Testament.

Submissive from His youth upwards to the authority of the Old Testament, Jesus found in it His chief spiritual nourishment.[2] He had a profound veneration for the religion of His fathers, and was deeply attached to His race. Consequently He loved the

[1] Monnier, p. 171. [2] O. Holtzmann, Leben Jesu, pp. 70–6.

Hebrew Bible, the Sacred Law of His nation; He regarded it as historically accurate and Divinely inspired.[1] He refers to it as the source and pattern of all godliness,[2] and His declaration that He has not come to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, and that Heaven and earth will pass away sooner than one iota of the Law,[3] is therefore perfectly natural.

In some other respects, it is true, Jesus adopts another point of view. He takes a very broad stand with regard to the Sabbath, declaring Himself Lord of it,[4] at a time when the Mosaic law pronounced sentence of death upon all who profaned the holy day.[5] He maintains that food cannot defile a man;[6] thereby seeming to take no account of the Levitical purifications and the distinction between clean and unclean foods, to which the Law attached such importance.[7] He condemns divorce,[8] in spite of its being justified in Deuteronomy.[9] He forbids the taking of oaths,[10] although this contravenes a custom sanctioned by the Old Testament.[11] To the law of retaliation, ratified by the same authority,[12] He opposes the practice of benevolence which knows no limits.[13] He does not submit, nor subject His disciples, to the

[1] Wendt, Die Lehre Jesu, 2nd ed., p. 139 et seq.; Meinhold, Jesus und das Alte Testament, p. 3 et seq.

[2] Mark x, 19; xii, 24, 26–7; Luke x, 26–8; xvi, 29–31. Cf. iv, 4, 8, 12; Matt. iv, 4, 7, 10.

[3] Matt. v, 17–18; Luke xvi, 17.

[4] Mark ii, 27.

[5] Ex. xxxi, 14; Num. xv, 32–6.

[6] Mark vii, 15.

[7] Lev. xi–xv.

[8] Mark x, 2–12; Luke xvi, 18; Matt. v, 31–2.

[9] Deut. xxiv, 1.

[10] Matt. v, 34–7.

[11] Ex. xxii, 10–11; Lev. xix, 12; Num. xxx, 3.

[12] Ex. xxi, 23 et seq.; Lev. xxiv, 19–20; Deut. xix, 21.

[13] Matt. v, 38–42; Luke vi, 29–30.

fasting[1] approved by the Scriptures.[2] He resists the trafficking in the vicinity of the Temple, thereby rendering the offering of sacrifices[3] ordained in so many passages of the Pentateuch an impossibility. He announces the destruction of the Temple,[4] which involves the suppression of the Jewish worship instituted by Moses. He even declares that the Law and the Prophets remained in force only until the coming of John the Baptist.[5]

How are we to reconcile all these points in which Jesus seems to be acting as a bold and resolute reformer, with His faith in the inspiration and Divine authority of the Scriptures? To overcome this difficulty the most varied solutions have been suggested.[6] One aspect of the problem or the other is often adopted by preference, and views which are either too conservative or too subversive are attributed to Jesus. If, however, we penetrate to the very root of the matter, we shall be convinced that He did not fall into either extreme. When the scribes and Pharisees ask Him why His disciples do not wash their hands before eating, He reproaches them with laying aside the commandments of God to hold the tradition of men, and treating the commandment to honour their parents[7] in the same way. Since He defends the authority of the Scriptures at the very moment when He seems to be attacking whole sections of the Mosaic Law, He cannot have contemplated

[1] Matt. xi, 18–19; Luke vii, 33; Mark ii, 18–19.

[2] 1 Sam. xxxi, 13; 2 Sam. xii, 16; Zach. vii, 5; Joel i, 14; ii, 12, 15; Dan. x, 3.

[3] Mark xi, 15–17. [4] Mark xiii, 1–2; xiv, 58; xv, 29.

[5] Luke xvi, 16; Matt. xi, 13.

[6] Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1890, p. 116 et seq.; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 184–210. [7] Mark vii, 6–13.

abolishing it. Again, if from His attitude with regard to fasting and to keeping the Sabbath, we are inclined to draw radical conclusions, we seem to be exceeding His views. According to Mark, He does not appear to have rejected fasting entirely, but to have declared that His disciples would fast later, when their Master had been taken from them.[1] If we follow Matthew, He would seem to have condemned the ostentation with which the Pharisees, for reasons of vanity, were accustomed to fast, just as He criticized a similar fault of theirs with regard to prayer and almsgiving.[2] One saying (though certainly of doubtful authenticity) is attributed to Him, according to which He would have held strictly to the observance of the Sabbath, when it did not clash with a higher duty.[3] It is of more consequence and also safer to affirm that He appealed to precedent and to the authority of the Old Testament[4] to justify the liberty He allowed Himself in this respect. In the same way He proceeded to justify His action in putting an end to the trading near the Temple.[5] Besides, He appeals to the Scriptures here.[6] When occasion serves He seems even to approve of the offering of sacrifices.[7] On the other hand, He is made to say that God, as the words of the prophet declare,[8] desires mercy and not sacrifice. If He restricts liberty of divorce, contravening the legal ordinance above-mentioned, He amends it by the statements in the Book of

[1] Mark ii, 20. This text seems to be of doubtful origin. See Loisy's Commentary.
[2] Matt. vi, 16–18 and 1–6.
[3] Matt. xxiv, 20.
[4] Mark ii, 25–6.
[5] Mark xi, 17.
[6] Mark ix, 13; xii, 10, 36.
[7] Matt. v, 23–4.
[8] Matt. ix, 13; xii, 7. Cf. Hos. vi, 6.

Genesis relating to the first pair of human beings.[1] His forbidding the taking of oaths and His abolition of the law of retaliation can scarcely be cited either as proof that Jesus sets His own authority above that of the Scriptures. Until the very end of His ministry He seems to have shewn Himself full of veneration for the Temple, though the words from which this may be seen are not His own.[2] It may even have been the prophetic words [3] which inspired Him to take such strong measures to combat the desecration of the sanctuary through the trading practised there. Perhaps He, too, may have paid the yearly tax due to the Temple.[4] On the eve of His death He must have celebrated the Jewish Passover with His disciples,[5] and if He did predict the fall of the Temple, it was only in connection with the announcement of the destruction of our world, and according to ancient prophecy.[6]

From what we have just seen it appears that Jesus upheld the Divine authority of the Old Testament. There is not a single passage in the Gospels which authorizes us to believe that He actually adopted a consciously critical attitude with regard to the Sacred Writings of His nation. If at times He should seem to do so, it is but seeming only, and to account for this we must always remember that Jesus was a simple layman, that He had made no special study of the subject, and that Biblical criticism, moreover, was unknown in His days. Down to our own times

[1] Mark x, 6–9. Cf. Gen. i, 27 ; ii, 24.
[2] Matt. xxiii, 16–21.
[3] Mark xi, 15–17. Cf. Jer. vii, 11 ; Is. lvi, 7.
[4] Matt. xvii, 24 et seq. Cf. Loisy on this passage.
[5] Mark xiv, 12–16.
[6] Mark xiii, 1 et seq. Cf. Micah iii, 12 ; Jer. xxvi, 18.

not only an enormous majority of ordinary believers, both Jews and Christians, but most of the theologians too, have paid little attention to the many divergences of opinion which the Bible contains. To them it appeared to be one indivisible whole, thoroughly consistent in all respects. At the same time, too, every individual believer found in it his own personal point of view. We need but think of Luther, to whom the Bible chiefly taught the doctrine of justification by faith and by pardoning grace. Before his day, St. Paul had relied upon the Old Testament for the support of all those theological theses which nobody before him had discovered in it, and which a really historical study would fail to find there. Thus, too, in the eyes of Jesus and His more immediate disciples, the whole of the Law and the Prophets could be reduced to the great commandment to love God above all and one's neighbour as one's self, or again, to the precept to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us.[1] Jesus used the Scriptures in His arguments with the scribes and Pharisees, evidently without taking into account that they, too, relied upon them for effective support of their own views.[2] In any case, His attitude in this respect was an essentially conservative one, and it has been transmitted to the whole of the Early Church.

One very important Old Testament influence upon Jesus is seen in an idea which is frequently affirmed in the Synoptic Gospels, as well as in texts from ancient sources. This idea is that salvation is to be

[1] Mark xii, 28–31; Luke x, 25–8; Matt. xxii, 36–40; vii, 12. Cf. Weinel, pp. 79–81.

[2] Mark vii, 5–13. Cf. Wernle, Anfänge, pp. 59–61.

the reward of faithful conduct,[1] and hence we have the promise that treasure is laid up in Heaven for the faithful.[2] These conceptions are indissolubly bound up with the authentic Gospel because, as we shall see, it is categorically affirmed there, many times over, that the establishment of the Kingdom of God will be preceded by the judgment-day, when everyone must appear before God, and render an account of his conduct and obtain salvation or else be condemned to perdition, according to what that conduct has been during his life on earth. Evidently we have to reconcile this cardinal point with the conception of the compassionate and pardoning love of God, which is just as explicitly announced in the Gospels. Moreover, Jesus' vehement denunciation of the mercenary self-seeking Pharisaism best proves that the ordinary popular eudæmonism was thoroughly displeasing to Him.[3]

On the other hand, we must not lose sight of the fact (as is so frequently the case) that both in the Scriptures and in other Jewish writings we have incontrovertible precedents which declare the pitying love of God for sinners. Of the God of Israel it is said that He is " merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin."[4] Let us in particular call to mind the words

[1] Matt. v, 3–12, 20; vi, 1 et seq., 16 et seq.; vii, 13–27; xviii, 7–9; xx, 1–16; xxiv, 45–51; xxv, 14–16; Mark ix, 41–8; x, 21, 28–31 and parallel passages; Luke vi, 23–35, 46–9; xii, 42–4; xiii, 6–9; xiv, 12–14; xvi, 19–31; xix, 11–25.

[2] Matt. vi, 20; Luke xii, 33.

[3] Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 258–65; Weinel, § 18–21; Wernle, Jesus, pp. 67–75.

[4] Ex. xxxiv, 6–7.

of the Psalmist, " The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide ; neither will He keep His anger for ever. He hath not dealt with us after our sins ; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is His mercy toward them that fear Him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgression from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." [1] Whilst the apostle Paul and many others after him have perceived but one single aspect of the Hebrew Bible, the wrath of God and the severity of the judgment revealed there, Jesus recognized everywhere, in the Scriptures and in Nature alike, the expression of God's Fatherly love, because He Himself experienced this love in His heart.

And we must not imagine, either, that this point of view was exceptional or rare in Judaism. On the contrary, we find that it occurs again and again, especially in the Psalter,[2] which, moreover, formed an important part of Jesus' spiritual sustenance. The book of Jonah, too, makes it clear that God is ready to pardon men, without distinction of persons, provided only that they repent of their sins.[3] Both there and in the verses already quoted we find the thoughts which underlie the parable of the Prodigal Son, that sublime illustration of Jesus' conception of

[1] Ps. ciii, 8–13.

[2] The following are passages in which God's pardoning love is specially noted : Ps. xxv, 6, 11 ; xxx, 6 ; xxxii, 5 ; li ; lxv, 4 ; lxxxvi, 5 ; cxxx, 3–4 ; Micah vii, 18–20 ; Ecclesiasticus ii, 11 ; l, 22 ; li, 3, 8. See, too, Bousset, pp. 438 et seq. ; Bertholet, pp. 236–46.

[3] Bertholet, pp. 154–5.

the Fatherly and compassionate love of God towards sinful and penitent man. Even in the Old Testament God is spoken of as a Father,[1] a Good Shepherd,[2] a Saviour,[3] mankind being represented as His children, or His sons and daughters.[4] In other ancient Jewish documents we find ideas and language corresponding with this, and also the expression "Heavenly Father", so frequently put into Jesus' mouth by Matthew.[5] There, too, we frequently find allusions to God's pity, mercy and pardon.[6]

4. The Ministry of Jesus.

Jesus began His ministry as soon as He had heard of the imprisonment of John by Herod Antipas.[7] We cannot doubt the truth of this statement, although it does not tally with the point of view given in the fourth Gospel.[8] It must also be admitted that Jesus first of all exercised His ministry chiefly in Galilee, as the Synoptic Gospels inform us, and not in Judea, as the fourth Gospel would have it.[9] The reason that prompted Jesus to renounce the calling of carpenter and start on His new career, was that He shared

[1] Deut. xiv, 1; xxxii, 6; 2 Sam. vii, 14; Jer. iii, 4, 19; xxi, 9; Is. lxiii, 16; lxiv, 7; Mal. i, 6; Ps. lxviii, 6; xxix, 27; ciii, 13; Ecclesiasticus xxxiii, 1, 14; li, 1, 10; Wisdom ii, 16; xi, 10; xiv, 13.

[2] Ps. xxiii, 1; Ecclesiasticus xviii, 13.

[3] Is. liii, 8; Wisdom li, 1–12.

[4] Is. lxiii, 8; Wisdom ix, 7; xii, 19–21; xvi, 10, 26; xviii, 4, 13; Ps. of Solomon xvii, 27; xviii, 4.

[5] Weber, p. 150; Bousset, pp. 433 et seq.

[6] Weber, pp. 149, 199, 250–2, 291–5.

[7] Mark i, 14–15; vi, 17 et seq.; Matt. iv, 12 et seq.

[8] Keim i, pp. 574–6, 588–590.

[9] John ii, 12; v, 47. Cf. Keim i, pp. 592–4; ii, pp. 10–12, 110 et seq.

John the Baptist's conviction that the advent of the Kingdom of God and the Last Judgment inseparably connected therewith, was close at hand, and He must spread abroad this tidings as rapidly as possible, so that men's hearts might be disposed to repentance, and they might be saved.[1] Moreover, He regarded the Jews as sheep without a shepherd, upon whom He had compassion, and whom He wished to bring back to the right path, while yet there was time.[2]

Jesus, therefore, became an itinerant preacher. Apparently He only continued John's ministry, announcing, as he did, the near approach of the Kingdom of God; but in reality a very notable difference between the two could soon be observed. The preaching of Jesus is called the Gospel or "good tidings",[3] because it actually was so. It was not the fear of God which was its predominating feature, as it had been in the Baptist's preaching, but the assurance of salvation, trust in God, and the joy and comfort it brings, for Jesus had a vivid idea of God's Fatherly love which was to be the central point of all His teaching. That is why the fasting practised by John and his disciples, and by the Pharisees, a practice expressive of sadness, seemed inappropriate to Jesus, who regarded Himself rather as a bridegroom rejoicing in the midst of His guests.[4] Instead of the threats upon which John had laid such stress, He proclaimed the promise of happiness and salvation.[5]

[1] Mark i, 15, 38–9; ii, 17; Matt. iv, 17, 23; x, 5–7, 23; Luke iv, 43; x, 9, 11.

[2] Mark vi, 34; Matt. ix, 36–7.

[3] Mark i, 14–15; Matt. iv, 23; xi, 5; Luke vii, 22.

[4] Mark ii, 18–19.

[5] Luke vi, 20–3; vii, 23; x, 23; xii, 37, 43; xiv, 14; Matt. v, 3–9; xi, 6; xiii, 16; xxiv, 47; xxv, 21–3.

Such mild and tender sentiments were not to be found in John's preaching, for he himself was still too much dominated by fear of the God of Sinai. In contrast to this, the infinite mercy of the Heavenly Father would be the pivot of Jesus' teaching and give it an entirely new impress; it would be productive of effects quite other than those of the harsh reprimands and severe threats of His precursor. Those would indeed have awakened men's consciences; these would fill their hearts with profound love both for the God of the Gospel and for Him whose touching and impressive words made it known to them.

As a preacher Jesus to some extent resembled the Jewish teachers, certain of whose methods He imitated. Following their example, He sometimes taught in the synagogues; like them, He gathered His disciples around Him, to instruct and make helpers of them. But the learned rabbis had been educated in the schools, which Jesus had not. Then, too, their bearing was that of the interpreters of the law, and theologians of their race, whilst Jesus was a simple layman and a man of the people like John the Baptist and some of the older prophets. Neither did He confine His teaching to the synagogues and small circles of hearers, but preached to large crowds attracted by His simple yet inspiring words, uttered at times upon a hilltop, and at others upon the sea-shore, the teacher seated in a boat, or yet again in the wilderness, in any place where circumstances proved favourable.

His style differed in many other respects from that of the Jewish teachers, and the populace were quick to note this.[1] Their learned men were pre-eminently

[1] Mark i, 21–22.

exegetists, interpreters of the Sacred Writings. They applied themselves to expounding with painstaking care, but in a method which left much to be desired, the Biblical passages, especially those relating to the Law, which formed the basis and foundation of the Jewish faith. Their theory was a slavish observance of the letter, and they claimed that not an iota of it might be abrogated. Their second rule of faith and the subject of their teaching was the Tradition of the Elders, and this they endeavoured to reproduce and transmit to their hearers, especially their actual disciples, with meticulous and scrupulous zeal. The words uttered by Jesus, on the other hand, were free and spontaneous. Above all, He expressed the thoughts and feelings of His own soul. A close communion with God, and a life in God, were really the main source of His inspiration. His teaching and exhortation were not dependent upon intellectual scholarship acquired by study, but arose spontaneously out of His own heart's inmost experience, and the impression He produced upon His hearers was all the more powerful. His authority, like that of the older prophets and the Baptist, was entirely a spiritual one. He spoke as the Spirit from above inspired Him at the moment. His words came from the heart, and deeply affected the hearts of others; they awakened the conscience and stimulated the will.

Jesus was moreover a very popular speaker, using words which would reach the level of the very simplest people, while yet continually discussing religious and moral questions of the very highest consequence. Therefore for a considerable part of His ministry we often find Him surrounded by an enormous crowd,

very loth to leave Him. To souls thirsting for enlightenment and truth, faith and hope, He offered spiritual sustenance of the most wholesome and satisfying nature. Sometimes His sayings were short and pithy, making a profound impression on the memory; and sometimes He expounded the truths of the Gospel in concrete form in those wonderful parables we know, which clearly demonstrate His truly great artistic gifts. He loved a paradox, for this excites attention and provokes thought.[1] He could also speak jestingly,[2] but when occasion demanded, He could just as readily chide, in an outburst of righteous anger, and He would hurl the most severe reprimands at His adversaries, especially the Pharisees, whose show of external piety was, in His eyes, the purest hypocrisy.[3]

The depth of Jesus' teaching and the remarkable form which clothed it have again and again been attested in our days, in spite of the critics' diversity of opinion regarding the value and interpretation of certain essentials of His doctrine.[4]

* * * * *

Side by side with the preaching of the Gospel, an integral part of Jesus' ministry was the healing of the sick, especially the casting-out of devils, for the ancients, who knew nothing of the natural causes of disease, attributed all maladies to the influence of

[1] Matt. v, 39–40; Luke vi, 29–30.

[2] Mark vii, 9; Luke vii, 31–4; xi, 5 et seq.; xviii, 1 et seq.; Matt. xi, 16–19.

[3] Matt. xxiii, 13–39; Luke xi, 39–52; xiii, 34.

[4] Hausrath, op. cit., i, pp. 356–65; Keim ii, pp. 101–10; Beyschlag, Das Leben Jesu, 2nd ed., i, p. 322 et seq.; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 173–8; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 229, 244.

evil spirits.[1] When Jesus sent forth His disciples as emissaries, He gave them this mission also.[2] Being a rabbi, it was part of His duty to tend the sick. Among the Jews there were scarcely any doctors save the rabbis or, speaking generally, men who were distinguished for piety. The Essenes and the Pharisees healed the sick, and that more by religious practices than therapeutic methods. Disease was in fact regarded as a punishment for sin, or the result of demoniacal possession.

Religious and moral agency being reputed specially efficacious in the healing of the sick, people had recourse to Jesus with this end in view, throughout the whole of His ministry. And since He Himself would assuredly hold the views of His contemporaries in this respect, He would naturally devote himself to the task of healing, for His compassionate nature would incline Him to relieve all the ills He saw around Him. He would feel obliged to do it, too, to drive away evil spirits and frustrate the work of the Devil, which was opposed to God's reign.[3] If we were to leave out of account this part of Jesus' ministry, our view of His activities would be incomplete. From the modern standpoint we cannot accord it the same value as His preaching, but Jesus Himself seems to have regarded the matter differently,[4] and it is an undisputed fact that He effected many cures, as indeed have the old Pagan sanctuaries and the shrines for pilgrims of Buddhist or Mohammedan or

[1] Mark i, 27, 32–4, 39; ii, 1 et seq.; iii, 22; vi, 55; Matt. xi, 5, 20 et seq.; xii, 22 et seq.; Luke vii, 22; xi, 14 et seq.

[2] Mark vi, 7, 12; Matt. x, 7–8; Luke ix, 2, 6; x, 9.

[3] Matt. xii, 28; Luke xi, 20.

[4] Matt. xi, 5–6; Luke vii, 22–3. Cf. Monnier, p. 44 et seq., however.

Catholic faith. But, although the natural causes of these cures may lie in certain psychological laws, they have always been regarded by most believers as purely miraculous.

If it is established beyond possibility of doubt that Jesus effected marvellous cures, it is just as certain that this aspect of His ministry has been very largely magnified. The tendency generally prevalent among the ancients to lay special stress upon the unusual and wonderful, was specially pronounced among the Jews,[1] who formed a large proportion of the Early Christians. Under its influence, all that was marvellous in the Gospel story went on increasing in strength as the facts grew more remote. In the original source of our Gospels nothing is known of a supernatural birth for Jesus, and the second and fourth Gospels have maintained this point of view. Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, recount many wonders relating to the birth and childhood of Jesus, at first unknown to the Church.[2] According to our oldest Gospel it was Jesus alone who saw the heavens opened and the Holy Spirit descending upon Him at the moment of His baptism ;[3] it seems to have been a purely personal vision, like those of the prophets of old. The later Gospels, on the contrary, give a much more objective and marvellous character to this occurrence.[4] In the original story of Jairus' daughter it is only the father who tells Jesus that she is at the point of death, and Jesus then affirms that she is

[1] 1 Cor. i, 22.

[2] This idea of the supernatural birth of Jesus, like so many other features of apostolic Christology, was inspired by an analogous concept then current throughout the ancient world. Vide Piepenbring, Christologie, pp. 111–14.

[3] Mark i, 10. [4] Luke iii, 22 ; John i, 32–3.

not dead, but sleeping.[1] In the later accounts the father was informed by others that his daughter was actually dead or dying.[2] Mark and Matthew relate the calling of Jesus' first disciples[3] very simply; Luke attaches to his account the story of a miraculous draught of fishes.[4] In cases where Mark speaks of the cures of *some* sick people only, the other Synoptic Gospels state that *all* the sick were cured by Jesus.[5] Or again when, according to the first Gospel, Jesus is merely teaching the people, the others represent Him as healing the sick also, or even portray Him as doing that alone.[6] In other passages, too, there is the same exaggeration of what is marvellous.[7] Therefore we must conclude that this tendency to magnify was assuredly exercised to some extent upon the Gospel tradition before it was committed to writing, and this behoves us to treat with a certain amount of reserve miraculous accounts derived even from the sources of these Gospels.

In olden times it was generally by means of miracles that the man of God was best accredited. Both Jews and Christians shared this point of view, and in particular they believed that the Messiah would be a personality distinguished in every respect from the rest, and therefore naturally so in his performance also. Among the Early Christians, then, it was

[1] Mark v, 23, 39.
[2] Matt. ix, 18; Luke viii, 42.
[3] Mark i, 16–20; Matt. iv, 18–22.
[4] Luke v, 1–11. Cf. John xxi, 2–8.
[5] Mark i, 34; iii, 10. Cf. Matt. viii, 16; xii, 15; Luke iv, 40; vi, 19.
[6] Mark ii, 2; vi, 34; x, 17–18. Cf. Luke v, 17; Matt. xiv, 14; xix, 2; xxi, 14.
[7] Matt. iv, 23–4; ix, 35; xv, 30–1; xvii, 24–7; Luke vii, 11–17, 21; xvii, 11–19; xxii, 51.

impossible to depict Jesus Christ without presenting Him as working a great many miracles, and in their desire to spread the Gospel, they were inclined to attribute yet others to Him. This was *par excellence* the method of winning over both Jews and Gentiles to the Christian faith. Our Gospels having evidently been written for apologetic and missionary ends, it is natural that as many miracles as possible [1] should have been collected there. With this aim in view, they have not merely been increased in number, but made to appear even more astonishing and marvellous, so that the resistance of the most stubborn minds might be overcome. A close comparison of the earliest Gospel narratives and their later additions is enough to convince us of this. Between the *Logia*, the most primitive source of the Gospels, and the Gospel of Mark, a striking difference in this respect is already to be seen, and between the latter and the more recent accounts the difference is no less perceptible.

The course indicated has been productive of other effects worthy of note. In the parable of the Barren Fig-tree, the tree evidently represents the Jewish nation, faithless towards God and, as a consequence, threatened with destruction.[2] Now this parable appears to have been the starting-point in constructing the story of one of the strangest and most improbable miracles in the Gospel. It is that which tells how Jesus, going from Bethany to Jerusalem, and wishing to gather figs at a time when there was as yet no ripe fruit on the trees, cursed the fig-tree and made it wither immediately because He

[1] See Matt. viii in confirmation of this.
[2] Luke xiii, 6–9.

found none.[1] The accounts of the miraculous multiplication of the loaves appear also to relate to the transformation into something marvellous, of certain symbolic words and acts, especially those of the fraternal love-feasts practised by the Early Christians, and first of all by Jesus and His disciples during His lifetime.[2] It is probably the same with the two miraculous draughts of fishes related in the Gospels.[3]

It has often been thought that Jesus healed the sick and performed miracles in His capacity of Messiah, to establish His work and manifest His Messianic character. This would appear to be actually the case if we allowed ourselves to be guided by the most recent portion of our Gospels, especially by that of John, which is the latest of all. Here, as a matter of fact, the miracles are presented as the means of revealing the glory and the Messiahship of Jesus. That, however, is the later point of view of the Evangelists and the Christian Church, not of Jesus Himself. If Our Lord had shared it He would have called attention to His cures and sought for opportunities of performing miracles, whilst He actually did exactly the opposite.[4] In His eyes, miracles were neither a proof of piety nor a means of producing it.[5] That is why He explicitly refused to work wonders to such an end, and particularly to blazon forth or

[1] Mark xi, 12–14, 20. Cf. Holtzmann and Loisy on these passages.

[2] Mark vi, 31–44; viii, 1–8. Cf. Holtzmann and Loisy; Goguel, Eucharistie, p. 51 et seq.

[3] Luke v, 1–11; John xxi, 1–14. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 443–6.

[4] Mark i, 44; v, 43; vii, 36; Matt. ix, 30; xii, 16.

[5] Matt. vii, 22; Mark xiii, 22; Luke xvi, 31.

accredit His Messiahship.[1] In this respect the fourth Gospel presents Jesus in a light which is diametrically opposed to that of the more historically accurate Gospel stories. According to the latter, so far from affirming or demonstrating His Messianic character, from the very beginning of His ministry, as this Gospel has it, He never spoke of it publicly, and did not even declare it openly to His disciples until towards the end of His ministry, as we shall see.[2]

[1] Mark viii, 11 ; Matt. xii, 38 ; Luke xi, 16–29. Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 307 et seq. ; Monnier, pp. 42–54.

[2] Upon the Gospel miracles, vide Keim, ii, pp. 125–204 ; Hase, § 43 ; Sabatier, Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses, vii, p. 378–86 ; Weiss, Leben Jesu, 2nd ed., i, pp. 447–74 ; Beyschlag, op. cit., i, pp. 288–321 ; A. Reville, Jésus de Nazareth, ii, p. 61–85 ; Staffer, Jésus Christ, ii, ch. x ; O. Holtzmann, Leben Jesu, pp. 148–54 ; Schmidt, ii, pp. 258–65 ; Carpenter, pp. 152–94 ; Weinel, pp. 143–7.

CHAPTER II

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

1. The Eschatological Nature of the Kingdom.

We have seen how fully Jesus shared John the Baptist's conviction of the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God, and that this conviction led Him to publish the tidings, from the time when John's imprisonment made it impossible for him to continue doing so.[1]

According to Matthew, Jesus preferred to make use of the expression " Kingdom of Heaven ",[2] whilst in the other Gospels we find the term " Kingdom of God " only. Is it really so difficult, as it seems to be from the disputes and subterfuges of theologians on this point, to decide which is the more authentic ?[3] The two expressions may be synonymous, Heaven, in the Jewish language of the day,[4] signifying God. Both denote the Messianic kingdom generally. On

[1] Vide chap. i, §§ 2 and 3.

[2] Matt. iv, 17 ; v, 3, 10, 19, 20 ; vii, 21 ; viii, 11 ; x, 7 ; xi, 11, 12 ; xiii, 11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52 ; xvi, 19 ; xviii, 1, 3, 4, 23 ; xx, 1 ; xxii, 2 ; xxiii, 13 ; xxv, 1.

[3] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 249–52.

[4] Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, 3rd ed., ii, pp. 538–9 ; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 229, note ; Holtzmann, op. cit., i, p. 251.

the other hand, Jesus believed, in accordance with the Book of Daniel (largely a source of inspiration to Him) that the Kingdom would have a celestial origin and nature, and from the world above, or under its influence, would come to establish itself upon earth, and remain there for ever.[1] This view, therefore, seems to plead for the authenticity of the term "Kingdom of Heaven"; nevertheless, there exists great doubt upon the point. Not only, indeed, is Matthew the only one to make use of this expression, but he alone among the Evangelists, frequently gives God the title of "Heavenly Father", or "Father which is in Heaven."[2] This evidently proves that he had a marked predilection for such language, borrowed from later rabbinism under the influence of ancient Babylonian and Persian terminology.[3] The expression, therefore, must emanate from him and not from Jesus. The best proof that the term "Kingdom of God" is the more authentic is that Matthew himself uses it when he is relying upon his most primitive source.[4] If the contrary were the case, we should not be in a position to explain how it is that the other expression is to be found in Matthew alone, and nowhere else in the New Testament.[5] It is not to be found in the Old Testament, nor in pre-Christian Jewish literature in general,

[1] Keim, ii, p. 36–38; J. Weiss, pp. 17–19, 105–7, 121, 162; Holtzmann, op. cit., i, pp. 249–50; Weinel, p. 50–1.

[2] Matt. v, 16, 45, 48; vi, 1, 9, 14, 26, 32; vii, 11, 21; x, 32, 33; xii, 50; xv, 13; xvi, 17; xviii, 10, 14, 19, 35; xxiii, 6. Mark does this only in xi, 25, under Matthew's influence. Vide Holtzmann and Klostermann on this subject.

[3] Bousset, pp. 359–61, 432–4; Clemen, Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments, pp. 248–9, 288.

[4] Matt. vi, 33; xii, 28; xxi, 31, 43.

[5] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 251.

either, whilst the parallel term is found in a number of instances.[1] So far from Matthew's language in this respect being primitive and more in accordance with that of Jesus, as has been maintained,[2] it is really the contrary that is true.[3]

The Greek word *basileia*, usually translated "Kingdom" in our Gospels, would be more correctly rendered "kingly rule", if we follow the terminology of the Old Testament, and more recent Jewish literature.[4] In the New Testament, too, both the name and the concept of a kingdom of God imply the idea of the reign of God. According to our modern thought, the concept of a kingdom of God is inseparable from that of a country or nation. The ancient Eastern mind did not view the matter thus. When speaking of a kingdom it did not first think of a people forming an association of citizens united under the same law, but of a nation subject to the will of a sovereign who was its lord and ruler. So when the Kingdom of God is mentioned in the Bible, the stress is not laid upon the members of the kingdom, but upon God, Who desires to establish His dominion or rule, and wills that His sovereignty shall prevail against all adverse powers.[5] This kingdom is actually opposed to the kingdoms of this world, subject to heathen rule, and to that of Satan.[6] This is the

[1] J. Weiss, p. 1 et seq.; Bousset, p. 245 et seq.; Schmidt, ii, pp. 133–40.

[2] Dallmann, Die Worte Jesu, p. 75, 150 et seq.

[3] J. Weiss, pp. 43–4; Harnack, Sprüche und Reden Jesu, p. 91 et seq.

[4] Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, p. 615; Bousset, pp. 245 et seq.; Monnier, p. 203, note 2. Cf. J. Weiss, p. 8 et seq.

[5] Weinel, pp. 49–51; Wrede, Vorträge und Studien, p. 91–2.

[6] Matt. iv, 8–9; xii, 25–9; Luke iv, 5–7; xi, 17–22; Mark iii, 23 et seq.

reason that, side by side with the preaching of the Gospel, the most important work for Jesus and His disciples was the casting out of devils in healing the sick, in order that Satan's work and power and rule might be brought to nought.[1] The concept of the Kingdom of God accordingly transcends any other in the preaching of Jesus, as in all Jewish revelation ; there is a similar dualism in both, since the two points are so intimately connected. Now such a dualism, foreign to the Israelites of olden days, was introduced into Judaism [2] from outside, and this explains why, to the degree in which the Gospel idea of the Kingdom of God differs from that of ancient Israel, it approximates that of Parseeism.[3] It has its roots, however, in Babylonian and Egyptian antiquity.[4]

Like John the Baptist, Jesus considered it unnecessary to say what He understood by the kingship or kingdom of God. Whenever He spoke of it He assumed that everybody knew what He was talking about. He directed no polemics against the Messianic hopes of His race. He did not presume to predict anything fresh on this head, but evidently shared the generally expectant attitude of the Jews with regard to it.[5] Had the contrary been the case He would assuredly have said so, in order to avoid misunderstanding. But in His authentic teaching we find no such declaration, and we must conclude that He

[1] Mark iii, 14–15 ; vi, 7, 12–13 ; ix, 17–27 ; Matt. x, 1, 7–8 ; xii, 24–32 ; Luke ix, 1–2, 6 ; x, 9 ; xi, 14–22 ; xiii, 32.

[2] Bousset, pp. 584–9 ; Bertholet, pp. 391–3.

[3] J. Weiss, pp. 30–5.

[4] Weinel, pp. 27–31.

[5] J. Weiss, p. 115 ; Pfleiderer, op. cit., i, p. 615 ; Wernle, Anfänge, p. 38 ; ibid., Jesus, p. 206 ; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 225 ; Wrede, op. cit., pp. 88–98.

followed the same great tide of Messianic thought as His Jewish contemporaries.

According to Jesus' authentic teaching the advent of the Kingdom of God is to be preceded by the resurrection from the dead, the elect being found with the patriarchs there,[1] like unto angels,[2] and in possession of celestial treasure,[3] whilst the impenitent of the generation then alive are to be condemned by the Queen of the South and the men of Nineveh.[4] Thus the Kingdom of God is synonymous with eternal life, and contrasted with hell.[5] Its establishment is to coincide with the renewal of the heaven and the earth.[6] In Jesus' eyes, therefore, the Kingdom of God would be a new era, an entirely fresh and glorious life, even a new and perfect world, brought about by God to replace the existing one.[7] Consequently nothing is more erroneous than the widespread idea that Jesus could have believed and taught that men could or should help to establish or advance the Kingdom of God.[8] This long maintained and still largely prevalent failure to recognize the fundamentally eschatological nature of the Gospel concept of the Kingdom of God, which formed the central point of Jesus' preaching, is in reality the blinding

[1] Matt. viii, 11 ; Luke xiii, 28. [2] Mark xii, 25.

[3] Matt. vi, 19–21 ; Luke xii, 33–4.

[4] Matt. xii, 41–2 ; Luke xi, 31–2 ; Cf. Wernle, Jesus, pp. 216–217.

[5] Mark ix, 43, 45, 47 ; x, 17, 23 ; Matt. vii, 14, 21 ; viii, 11–12 ; xviii, 8–9.

[6] Matt. v, 18 ; xix, 28 ; Luke xvi, 17 ; Mark xiii, 24–31 Cf. J. Weiss, pp. 105–8.

[7] Cf. Mark xiv, 25 ; x, 30.

[8] J. Weiss, p. 73 et seq. ; Piepenbring, Principes fondamentaux de l'enseignment de Jésus, p. 16 et seq. ; Wernle, Anfänge, p. 49 ; ibid., Jesus, p. 221, 234.

one's eyes to the truth.[1] There are undoubtedly many passages in the Gospels which countenance this error, but such passages express the later ideas of the Apostolic Church, and not the true thought of Jesus.

Since He expected the Kingdom of God in the future only, He spoke of it generally in prospective terms. He began His ministry by declaring that the Kingdom was at hand.[2] Later He charged His disciples to announce the same thing.[3] The very night before His death, in one of the most reliable of His sayings, He expressed Himself in a similar way.[4] Thus we see that never, during the whole course of His ministry, did Jesus believe, or would He have been able to believe, that the Kingdom was actually in existence. It is therefore natural that in many Gospel passages the Kingdom should be regarded as of prospective grandeur.[5] Traditional theology has gone astray in this respect, because it has confused the Church or Christian life with the Kingdom of God, and even attributed to Jesus the foundation of the Church which, as we shall see, is equally erroneous. Maurenbrecher, following neither traditional nor modern theology, but a socialist trend, maintains that Jesus believed the Kingdom of God to have been in existence from the beginning of His ministry until the night before His death when, recognizing His

[1] Loisy, L'Evangile et l'Eglise, 4th ed., pp. 33–54; Weinel, p. 52 et seq.

[2] Mark i, 15; Matt. iv, 17.

[3] Matt. x, 7; Luke x, 9, 11.

[4] Mark xiv, 25. Cf. Luke xxi, 31.

[5] Matt. v, 4–9, 11–12, 20; vi, 10; vii, 21–3; viii, 11–12; xvi, 28; xviii, 3; xix, 12, 23–5, 27–30; xx, 21; xxv, 1 et seq.; 31 et seq.; xxvi, 29; Mark ix, 1, 43, 45, 47; x, 15, 17, 23, 26, 37, 40; xii, 34; xv, 43; Luke vi, 20–3; ix, 27; xi, 2; xii, 31; xiii, 22–30; xiv, 15–24; xxii, 16, 18, 29–30; xxiii, 42, 51.

mistake, He had a fit of despair,[1] but our exposition controverts this view of the matter.

2. Other Characteristics of the Kingdom of God.

Since Jesus in so many respects shared the traditional expectation of the Kingdom of God, did He also entertain the idea that it would be here upon earth, and that the Jewish race would occupy a privileged place in it? It is certain that the promise of a kingdom implies possession of the earth.[2] We are to ask that God's Kingdom should come, so that the will of God may be done on earth as it is in Heaven.[3] The chosen of God, having come from the east and the west to enter the Kingdom, will sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,[4] who are supposed to be restored to life and living upon earth. The disciples are to eat and drink at His table,[5] evidently on earth. If the possessions of the Kingdom are spoken of as Heavenly treasure, it implies that God is their guardian and that He is keeping them in reserve in Heaven till the day of salvation.[6] Although we are told that the elect will be like angels,[7] we must not lose sight of the fact that they are not depicted as purely spiritual by nature. Moreover, from the advent of the Kingdom of God everything will be renewed, both the heaven and the earth. Therefore it is upon a transfigured earth that the Kingdom will

[1] Von Nazareth nach Golgotha, passim.
[2] Matt. v, 5.
[3] Matt. vi, 10; Luke xi, 2.
[4] Matt. viii, 11; Luke xiii, 28–9.
[5] Luke xxii, 30; Mark xiv, 25.
[6] Mark x, 21; Matt. v, 12; vi, 20; Luke vi, 23; xii, 33.
[7] Mark xii, 25.

be founded,[1] and it is only such a concept of it as this, that tallies with Biblical cosmogony, which regards this earth as the centre of the universe.

In reply to the second part of the question, it must be said that at the beginning of His ministry Jesus was still influenced, to some extent at least, by the Jewish particularism. He chose twelve disciples to assist Him in His ministry.[2] This number corresponds with the twelve tribes of Israel and shows that the salvation of His own race was Jesus' main concern.[3] He never preached the Gospel to the heathen, nor ordered His disciples to do so, and when entrusting them with their missionary enterprise, He directed them to preach solely to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and not to go to the Gentiles nor enter the villages of Samaria.[4] He believed that in the Kingdom of God the company of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would be enjoyed.[5] He sought out publicans and sinners because in them, too, He saw the children of Abraham.[6] He promised His disciples that when He should sit on the throne of His glory, they should be established as governors and judges over the twelve tribes of Israel[7] Thus we can understand how it was that His Messianic title should have been interpreted as King of the Jews,[8] and that His disciples

[1] Keim, ii, pp. 41–9; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 249 et seq.; Krop, pp. 29–31; Schmidt, ii. pp. 143–6; Feine, pp. 95–6; Wernle, Jesus, p. 205–6.

[2] Mark iii, 14–19; vii, 7; Matt. xix, 28; Luke xxii, 30; 1 Cor. xv. 5.

[3] Cf. Luke xiii, 6–9, 34; Matt. xxiii, 37.

[4] Matt. x, 5–6, 23–4. Cf. xv, 24, 26–7; Mark vii, 27–8. Cf. Weinel, p. 99–100.

[5] Matt. viii, 11; Luke xiii, 28–9.

[6] Luke xix, 9.

[7] Matt. xix, 28; Luke xxii, 30. Cf. Mark x, 35–7, 40.

[8] Mark xv, 18, 26.

should have expected Him to restore the kingdom to Israel.[1] All these points warrant us in believing that Jesus did conceive of the Kingdom of God as a form of Jewish theocracy, and in this He followed the example of even the most universalist of the ancient prophets and the whole tradition of His race.[2] Such a method of regarding it was long maintained in the Apostolic Church.[3]

But in this respect there was evidently an evolution in Jesus' thought during the course of His ministry, and that on account of a twofold experience. On the one hand, He made the sad discovery that His work for His nation, far from being crowned with success, as He had doubtless hoped at first, did not attain the desired result. Many of the Jews did not profit by His ministry and repent of their sins.[4] They paid no heed to His words, and incurred severe censure.[5] They disregarded the invitation to the Great Marriage Supper.[6] They were unable to discern the signs predicting the day of salvation.[7] The Gospel seed fell largely upon unfruitful ground.[8] The Jewish nation profited as little by Jesus' ministry as they had done by that of John the Baptist.[9] It went on, therefore, drawing down upon itself severe judgment and condemnation.[10] Its condition went from bad to

[1] Acts i, 6; Luke xxiv, 21; xix, 11; Mark xi, 10; x, 35 et seq.
[2] Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 281–2; Wernle, Jesus, pp. 253 et seq.
[3] Rev. xxi, 9—xxii, 5.
[4] Matt. xi, 20–4; Luke x, 13–15; cf. iv, 24 et seq.
[5] Matt. vii, 21–7; viii, 11, 12; Luke xiii, 26–9; vi, 47–9.
[6] Luke xiv, 16 et seq.; Matt. xxii, 1 et seq.
[7] Luke xii, 54–7; Matt. xvi, 1–3.
[8] Mark iv, 3–9.
[9] Matt. xi, 16–19; Luke vii, 31–5.
[10] Luke xi, 29–32; Matt. xii, 39, 41–2.

worse,[1] and destruction threatened it.[2] The leaders of the Jewish people violently opposed Jesus Himself and thus evoked His most trenchant criticisms.[3]

On the other hand, He had such experiences as the following. A centurion came to beg Him to heal his son (or his servant), and manifested so much faith that Jesus was astonished, and declared that He had not found such faith in Israel.[4] A Canaanitish woman, asking Him to heal her son, displayed so much tact and good sense that He was constrained to accord her words of praise and give her the help she desired, although He had at first refused it.[5] He must have had other encouraging experiences of the same kind.[6] These would have led Him to the conviction that the Jews, in part at least, would be rejected from the Kingdom of God, or else outstripped by the heathen.[7] He does not, however, seem to have laid stress upon this point, for His immediate disciples had no idea of undertaking a mission to the heathen after His death.[8] Perhaps, like the prophets of old, He thought that the Kingdom of God, once established, would immediately attract the whole pagan world.[9]

[1] Luke xi, 24–6; Matt. xii, 43–5.

[2] Luke xiii, 1–9, 34; Matt. xxiii, 37; Mark xiii, 2.

[3] Mark ii, 15–17, 23—iii, 5, 22–9; vii, 1–23; Luke vii, 36 et seq.; xi, 14–23, 39, 42–52 and parallel passages; xiii, 10–17; xv, 1 et seq.; Matt. xii, 22–32; xv, 1–20.

[4] Luke vii, 1–10; Matt. viii, 5–10, 13.

[5] Mark vii, 24–30, and Matt. xv, 26, which is more primitive than Mark vii, 27.

[6] Luke xvii, 11–19. Cf. x, 30–7.

[7] Matt. viii, 11–12; xi, 21–3; xii, 39, 41–2; xix, 30; xx, 16; xxii, 1–10; Luke x, 13–15; xi, 29–32; xiii, 6–9, 28–30; xiv, 16–21, 24.

[8] Piepenbring, Jésus et les Apôtres, pp. 8–9.

[9] Is. ii, 2–4; Micah iv, 1–3. Cf. Wernle, Jesus, pp. 260–3.

There are other features which complete this picture. John the Baptist had given his hearers to understand that their being of the seed of Abraham was not sufficient to secure them admission to the Kingdom of God,[1] and Jesus had borne witness to John's supreme position as a prophet.[2] Then, too, the conditions of salvation, which formed the main theme of all His preaching, do not contain a single exclusively Jewish characteristic, but are all essentially ethical and, consequently, thoroughly general in their nature.[3] To awaken in His hearers a love of God and trust in Him, Jesus refers to God's dealings with men and with all creation,[4] rather than with Israel merely, or with the Jewish nation, as is generally the case in the Old Testament. These liberal principles of His led Jesus first to break away from the rigidity of the Pharisees, who would deny salvation to multitudes who were unable strictly to perform all the requirements of the Law, and later they brought about a rupture with that extreme Jewish particularism which would equally exclude all the heathen.[5]

He also dissociated Himself from the too political aspect which most of His race had always been accustomed to attribute to the Kingdom of God or the Messianic rule. He certainly hoped that it would put an end to any foreign domination in His country, to which throughout His life He was devotedly

[1] Matt. iii, 9; Luke iii, 8.
[2] Matt. xi, 9–11; Luke vii, 26–8.
[3] Piepenbring, op. cit., p. 17 et seq.
[4] Matt. v, 44–5; vi, 25 et seq.; vii, 9–11; x, 28–31; Luke vi, 35; xi, 10–13; xii, 6, 22 et seq.
[5] Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 277–83; Weinel, pp. 100–102.

attached.[1] But since He thought that all the kingdoms of this world were controlled by Satan, and that God would put an end to his power it did not occur to Him to resort to political expedients to attain this end, as the Jews, especially the Zealots,[2] so frequently did. Neither had He the slightest desire to oppose the Roman Empire in any way whatever, but answered those who sought to embarrass Him by an insidious question on the matter, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."[3]

The teaching of Jesus, unlike the Jewish apocalypses, did not enter into details about the future world and the life there; He gave no actual description of it, but was very guarded in this respect.[4] Since His idea of God was at all times a comparatively pure and exalted one, and He conceived of Him as absolutely holy, just and merciful, being persuaded that God Himself would establish His kingdom upon earth, He necessarily adjusted all His ideas of the future to that standard. Certain signs, moreover, shew clearly that touching the world to come, which is hidden from our eyes, His views were at once more moderate and more spiritual than those of most of His Jewish contemporaries. He did not content Himself with saying that in the Kingdom of God the elect would be delivered from all the ills of this world and enjoy perfect bliss,[5] but promised that those who hungered

[1] Matt. xix, 28; Luke xxii, 30.

[2] J. Weiss, pp. 123–5; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 231–2; Weinel, pp. 102–4.

[3] Mark xii, 17. Cf. Wernle, Jesus, p. 298 et seq.

[4] Weinel, pp. 55–7.

[5] Matt. v, 4–5, 10–12; viii, 11; xxiv, 46–7; xxv, 21, 23; Luke vi, 20–3; xii, 37–8, 43; xiv, 14.

and thirsted after righteousness should be filled, that the merciful should obtain mercy, that the pure in heart should see God, and the peacemakers be called the children of God.[1]

These sayings and others of a like nature have given the Gospel idea of the Kingdom of God permanent and supreme value, independent of the Jewish character of it noted above, which the influence of His surroundings had imposed on Jesus, although it was contradicted by facts. To avoid this last conclusion, and the necessity of admitting that Jesus was as mistaken in some respects as His Jewish contemporaries, there has been much unsound spiritualization of His eschatology, based chiefly on the latest and least authentic of the Gospels.[2] To be thus shocked by any "error" on Jesus' part, an error shared by all the Jews of His day, is what has been aptly described as "petrified" dogmatism.[3]

While in the main holding most of the views of His times and surroundings with regard to the Last Things, Jesus did not profess that His eschatology was complete and perfect in all respects.[4] In any case He believed that the Judgment which would precede the establishment of the Kingdom of God would have the effect of separating the good from the bad, believers from unbelievers, the former alone being admitted to the Kingdom to enjoy eternal life and salvation, while the latter would be

[1] Matt. v, 6–9.

[2] See for example Bruston, La vie future d'après l'enseignement de Jésus Christ. Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 397.

[3] J. Weiss, p. 105.

[4] J. Weiss, pp. 113–21; Weinel, p. 116 et seq.; Wernle, Jesus, p. 207 et seq. Cf. Holtzmann, op. cit., i, p. 398 et seq.

excluded.[1] According to Him, these would be cast into Gehenna, represented as a fiery furnace in the depths of the earth, not far from Jerusalem.[2] He did not hold the view of universal salvation so freely preached in our own day. On the contrary, in His opinion the number of the elect would be very small.[3] Most of mankind, indeed, would follow the broad path leading to destruction;[4] their attitude to the Gospel would be a hostile one,[5] and until the end they would lead a thoroughly worldly life.[6] Jesus, believing in the resurrection from the dead,[7] expected a general resurrection on the Day of Judgment, when each one would be judged according to his works.[8] Since in the other world the elect were to resemble angels,[9] they would naturally have to undergo transformation.[10] Their new life would not be purely spiritual, however, for there they would still eat and drink.[11] God Himself would execute judgment and decide upon the everlasting fate of each.[12]

[1] Matt. v, 20; vii, 13–14, 21–7; viii, 12; xviii, 8–9; xxiv, 45–51; xxv; Mark ix, 43, 45, 47; Luke vi, 46–9; x, 25 et seq.; xii, 40–8; xiii, 3, 5, 25–7; xix, 12–24.

[2] Matt. v, 22, 29, 30; x, 28; xviii, 8, 9; Mark ix, 43, 45, 47; Luke xii, 5; xvi, 24. Cf. Meyer and Bleek on Matt. v, 22; Wittichen, Leben Jesu, p. 427–8; J. Weiss, p. 112–13.

[3] Matt. vii, 14; xxii, 14; Luke xii, 32; xiii, 24.

[4] Matt. vii, 13.

[5] Matt. v, 10–12; x, 14, 24 et seq.; Luke vi, 22; x, 3, 10 et seq.; xii, 4 et seq., 51–3; xiv, 26.

[6] Matt. xxiv, 37–41; Luke xvii, 26–37.

[7] Mark xii, 24–7.

[8] Matt. xi, 20–4; xii, 41–2; Luke x, 13–15; xi, 31–2. Cf. J. Weiss, pp. 110–11.

[9] Mark xii, 25.

[10] 1 Cor. xv, 50–4; J. Weiss, pp. 109–10.

[11] Mark xiv, 25; Matt. viii, 11–12; xxii, 1 et seq.; Luke xiii, 29; xiv, 15 et seq.; xxii, 30. Cf. J. Weiss, 120–1.

[12] Matt. x, 28; xviii, 23–35; xx, 1–15; xxii, 1–10; Luke xii, 5; xiv, 16–24. Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 392–5

3. Modifications of the Idea of the Kingdom of God.

In the early days of the Church the conception of the Kingdom of God soon underwent serious modifications, and this was inevitable, since the end of the world, proclaimed by Jesus to be approaching, did not take place. The apostle Paul, too, who in so many respects followed his own course, independent of the Jewish-Christians, was obliged to do so on this important point also. Moreover, we now know that there was a strong Pauline influence brought to bear upon our oldest Gospel, that of Mark, which served (as we shall see in the Appendix attached to this volume) as the source of the others, and this influence accordingly extends to them all. The cardinal point of Jesus' preaching must evidently have been equally affected by this influence, and this it is which we have now to prove.

The apostle of the Gentiles in no respect renounced, but rather insisted upon, the eschatological nature of the Kingdom of God, the full and complete realization of which he did not anticipate until the end of the world in which he lived.[1] At the same time, however, he taught that since His resurrection Jesus was exercising true sovereignty,[2] above all in the Church.[3] At one time he declares that the Kingdom of God is not in word but in deed,[4] and at another, that it is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.[5] Here we have a fresh

[1] 1 Thess. ii, 12; iv, 15–17; Gal. i, 4; v, 21; 1 Cor. vi, 9–10; xv, 42–50; 2 Cor. iv, 17; v, 10; Rom. viii, 18–25, Col. iii, 24–5; Phil. iv, 6.

[2] 1 Cor. xv, 24–5; Col. i, 13; ii, 9–15.

[3] Col. i, 18, 24, Cf. Eph. i, 22–3.

[4] 1 Cor. iv, 20.

[5] Rom. xiv, 17.

conception of the Kingdom of God, one which identifies it with the influence of the Holy Spirit and of the glorified Christ in the hearts of men and in the Church, thus adding to its eschatological character a present, moral significance.

The New Testament shows how very rapidly many of Paul's views became current among the Early Christians. It was the case with those we have just mentioned. We see this again clearly in the Revelation of St. John the divine. According to him, after His death and resurrection Christ lives on from age to age, holding the keys of death and hell.[1] He is seated with God the Father upon His throne, where He exercises sovereign power.[2] Thence He issues His orders to the Church of which He is the Head. He knows all their works and reproves them when necessary.[3] He "walketh in the midst" of them.[4] By His blood once shed He has purchased unto God men of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, to be unto God a kingdom.[5] These ideas scarcely tally, if at all, with other parts of the book, which predict a speedy end to the world.[6] They have evidently been borrowed from the Churches which promulgated them. They are based upon the idea that Jesus by His resurrection has become the heavenly King whose kingdom consists of Christians or Churches. They are above all the outcome of the Pauline mission to the heathen world.

It is natural that we should find a similar point of view in our Gospels, all of which are of more recent date than the Pauline Epistles. This can be most clearly seen in Matthew's Gospel, which contains more

[1] Rev. i, 18. [2] Rev. iii, 21. [3] Rev. ii, 2 et seq. [4] Rev. ii, 1.
[5] Rev. v, 9–10; i, 6. [6] Rev. xi, 2–3; xii, 6, 14; xiii, 5.

recent features than the other Synoptics. Influenced by Pauline doctrine, which assigns to the glorified Christ an actual kingdom in the world, and especially within the fold of Christianity, his Gospel puts into the mouth of Jesus the following statements : " Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." [1] " All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and earth. . . . Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." [2] These concluding words of the Gospel, which is in part dominated by later dogma, put the crowning touch to it, but reveal, too, how great is the distance that separates it from the more ancient Gospel sources, where we find nothing at all approaching them.

Similar views are expressed elsewhere in this Gospel. The parable of the Tares,[3] which is a later product,[4] speaks of the kingdom of the Son of Man, whence the offences of those who work iniquity must be removed.[5] This kingdom of the Son, distinct from that of the Father,[6] as we see from later passages in Matthew,[7] is evidently borrowed from Apostolic, and especially Pauline, theology.[8] This new concept of the Kingdom of God, found also in the parable of the Net,[9] is moreover inspired by the existence of the Church, which includes unworthy members side by side with true Christians. Now the very idea of the

[1] Matt. xviii, 20.
[2] Matt. xxviii, 18, 20. Cf. Phil. ii, 9 et seq ; Rev. i, 5.
[3] Matt. xiii, 24–30, 36–43.
[4] Holtzmann and Loisy, on this passage ; Feine, p. 10.
[5] Matt. xiii, 41–2. [6] Matt. v, 43. [7] Matt. xxv, 31–46.
[8] 1 Cor. xv, 24–5 ; Col. i, 13. Cf. J Weiss, p. 40–1.
[9] Matt. xiii, 47–50. Cf. Holtzmann and Loisy on this passage ; Feine, p. 111.

Church is entirely foreign to Jesus' real thought.[1] Matthew goes so far as to speak of the "children of the Kingdom" in the sense of simple believers, whether Jews or Christians;[2] and he presents the matter as if the Kingdom were already existing among the Jewish people.[3] It is therefore only natural that this kingdom should figure in his writings as a present reality[4] but, as we have just seen, it is he and not Jesus who expresses it thus.[5]

There seems to be a reflection of the parable of the Tares in all the other parables of the thirteenth chapter of Matthew's Gospel, and in others too, so that they might all be brought together under the heading of the Kingdom of God, even when the idea is foreign to them.[6] This shews that to this Evangelist the Kingdoms of God and of Christ appear to be synonymous with the Church. The latter, though never mentioned in the sources of the Gospels, was of very great significance to Matthew; he attributes the foundation of it to Jesus Himself, and explicitly identifies it with the Kingdom of Heaven.[7] Elsewhere he supposes it to be in existence during the lifetime of Jesus.[8] The idea of the Church and its function appear again, in a slightly different form, in the parable of the Marriage Supper which, in this Gospel, forms a corollary of those of the Tares and the Fishing Net.[9]

[1] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 268–74; Loisy, on Matt. xvi, 17–19; Feine, pp. 109–11; Weinel, pp. 106–8.

[2] Matt. viii, 12; xiii, 38. [3] Matt. xxi, 43; cf. xiii, 52.

[4] Matt. v, 3, 10; xi, 11–12; xiii, 52; xviii, 1, 4; xxiii, 13.

[5] Cf. Holtzmann, op. cit., i, pp. 393–4.

[6] J. Weiss, pp. 45–9; Weinel, pp. 48–9; cf. Krop, pp. 74–80; Monnier, pp. 213–16; Holtzmann, i, p. 288.

[7] Matt. xvi, 18. [8] Matt. xviii, 17.

[9] Matt. xxii, 1–14. Cf. Holtzmann, i, p. 272–3.

In Luke's Gospel, which shews no direct trace of the idea of the Church, and in which the conception of the Kingdom of God is generally of a frankly eschatological character, the tendency that we have just noted in the first Gospel seems however to present itself in one single instance, when Jesus answers some of the Pharisees by saying that the Kingdom of God comes not with outward signs, that we cannot say that it is here, or there, but that it is within them or among them.[1] It is very strange that this statement (which contradicts what immediately follows, and stands alone in the whole Gospel, not being found in the other Synoptics), a statement, moreover, which lends itself to the most varied interpretations,[2] should at all times have served to define the true nature of the Kingdom of God, and still is used to such an end in numerous publications, both scholarly and simple. It proves how much those in the fold of Christianity desire the idea of the Kingdom of God to be of a different character from that given to it in the original Gospel. They would have it, not eschatological but ethical, which would allow of its being identified with the Christian life, either individual or general.

Of all the many diverse explanations evoked by the words in question, which declare the Kingdom of God to be actually existent, although their context, borrowed from an ancient source, presumes the contrary,[3] the most probable, to our mind, is that of Pfleiderer. According to this discerning critic, the text is not only inspired by a later point of view,

[1] Luke xvii, 20–1.

[2] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 291, note 3.

[3] Cf. Luke xvii, 20–1 with v, 22–37 and Matt. xxiv, 23, 26–7, 37–9, 17–18, 40–1, 28.

but is intended to correct or modify the authentic eschatological statements of Jesus which follow it.[1] Christians in fact soon noted that the predictions of the speedy end of the world and the advent of the Kingdom of God, which Jesus had represented as a world-catastrophe observable by all, were not being realized. To extricate themselves from the difficulty, therefore, they tried to impress upon the idea of the Kingdom a new character, an inner, spiritual, or ethical one. It was probably in this way that the words of Luke in question grew out of the influence of the Epistle to the Romans xiv, 17, which permits of the most natural translation : " The kingdom of God is within you." If, on the other hand, we translate it, as others would have it : " The kingdom of God is among you ", we must again seek its inspiration in the apostle Paul and his identification of the Church with the Kingdom of God.

In Mark's Gospel there is but one single instance of the Kingdom of God being treated as in existence at the time,[2] but the immediate context shews us that here the present is to be taken in a future sense,[3] as is the case elsewhere.[4] Nor must we lose sight of the fact that the Jews, like Jesus and the Early Church, believed the Kingdom of God and all its possessions to be already existing in heaven. They were, then, actual possessions, although not to be found on earth, and for this reason one might upon occasion speak of them in the present, although they were absent from this world.[5]

[1] Urchristentum, i, p. 453 ; Entstehung, p 70–1. Cf. Loisy, L'Evangile et l'Eglise, pp. 51–4. [2] Mark x, 14.
[3] Mark x, 15. [4] J. Weiss, pp. 72–3 ; Krop, pp. 72–3.
[5] Rev. iii, 12 ; xxi, 1 ; xxii, 5 ; Gal. iv, 26 ; Heb. xi, 10, 16 ; xii, 22 ; xiii, 14. Cf. Bousset, pp. 299, 321 et seq. ; J. Weiss, pp. 96–9, 106.

But if we are to attribute to Jesus the idea that the Kingdom of God was a present one,[1] we have to interpret passages borrowed from the sources of the Gospels themselves in the contrary sense, and, moreover, to corroborate this, we must rely upon texts which are less primitive. In our days this has led to the most tremendous controversy between the two opposing points of view, and yet others which are more or less intermediate.[2] We need not, however, be in any way shaken in our view of the matter, which always triumphs over the other, and with sufficient reason. We have indeed seen that on the very eve of His death Jesus expected the Kingdom of God in the future only. We must add, moreover, that it was not only Pauline and Johannine theology that underwent a modification, but that the early apostles also, soon after the death of Jesus, were obliged in many respects to enter upon a new path. For they were only able to resume the preaching of the Gospel by presupposing the Christ to be risen, glorified, seated on the right hand of God, and thence directing the Christians who soon formed a Church or Kingdom of which He was the invisible head and ruler. This fresh view derived from the apostolic preaching inevitably found its way into the Gospel story, all the more so because, for a whole generation, believers continued to expect the return of Christ and therefore felt the less need of writing down their recollections of Jesus and His doctrines. When they finally did start upon them, many and serious alterations, though doubtless involuntary ones, were mingled

[1] Matt. xi, 4–6, 11–12; xii, 28; xiii, 31–3; Luke vii, 22–3, 27, and xvi, 16; xi, 20; xiii, 18–21.

[2] See Holtzmann on this subject, Theologie, i, pp. 284–95.

with the Gospel memoirs, and these were also largely encroached upon by arguments answering to the growing needs of Christian communities. This state of things, therefore, demands a much more exhaustive selection of the matter contained in the Gospels, even of the Synoptics, than any that one has attempted hitherto.

Let us note, too, that the idea of the indwelling Kingdom of God, which in Luke xvii, 21, is opposed to the eschatological concept, may easily be reconciled with certain of Jesus' opinions. He indeed continually assumes that every man is capable of doing right to some extent, as certain parts of this chapter and of the one which follows will show. He even explicitly affirms that all men are possessed of some spiritual enlightenment.[1] Hence follows the natural conclusion, expressly attributed to Our Lord, that His disciples by their good works are to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world.[2]

[1] Luke xi, 34–6; Matt. vi, 22–3.
[2] Matt. v, 13–16; Mark ix, 50; Luke xi, 35.

CHAPTER III

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION

1. Conversion and a New Life.

Although Jesus considered the establishment of the Kingdom of God to be the work of God Himself and not of men, the latter have nevertheless some effort to make in view of this great event; they must act in such a way as to dispose God to establish His reign upon earth. Above all, they must render themselves worthy to enter the Kingdom, so that they may not be excluded by reason of their unfitness, but may enjoy salvation and the privileges attaching to it.

Like the prophets of old and John the Baptist, Jesus regarded repentance and conversion [1] as the primary condition for attaining this end. And by this He did not mean a formal penitence accompanied by fasting and other ascetic practices, such as we meet with in the Jewish and Catholic Churches and elsewhere. In this respect He was inspired, too, by the essentially ethical principles of the most distinguished of the earlier prophets. To Him, repentance meant a real change of heart and life; it involved

[1] Mark i, 15; vi, 12; Matt. iv, 17; xi, 20–1; xii, 41; xviii, 3; xxi, 32; Luke x, 13; xiii, 3, 5; xv, 7, 10, 17–24; xvi, 30; xviii, 13. Cf. Weinel, pp. 159–62.

the practice of a justice or morality higher than that of the scribes and Pharisees ; it consisted not merely in avoiding any external breach of the commandments of God, but in uprooting from the heart all evil thoughts and desires—in being pure, loving, perfect like God.[1] According to Him the essentially Divine commandments are ethical laws and not ritual ordinances.[2] They are the will of God, which must be done to become a true disciple of Jesus and assured of salvation.[3] Worship is not done away with, however, but it is to be subordinated to morality.[4]

Jesus did not enter into details of the moral life. He might suppose His hearers to be conversant with such details, for the Jews possessed an elaborate literature dealing with the conduct of everyday life. Neither would Jesus have felt the necessity of laying any stress upon it, because He believed in the near approach of the end of the world, which would bring about the advent of the Kingdom of God, when the Divine will would naturally be done throughout the earth, and perfect justice would be the rule among men.[5] He was chiefly concerned with the duties of the existing world, from the point of view of the eternal life about to dawn. To this end He was

[1] Matt. v, 3–10, 20–48 ; xviii, 8–9 ; Mark ix, 43–5, 47 ; Luke vi, 27–36. Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 256-7. In the language of the Bible the term *justice* has a very wide connotation. It is synonymous with virtue and piety. This terminology is due to the fact that Jewish piety was always of a juridical character. J. Weiss, p. 145 et seq. ; Krop, p. 35 et seq.

[2] Mark vii, 1–23.

[3] Matt. vii, 21–7 ; xxi, 31 ; Luke vi, 47–9 ; xii, 47 ; xiii, 25–7 ; Mark iii, 34–5.

[4] Matt. v, 23–4 ; ix, 13 ; xii, 7, 11–12 ; xxiii, 23 ; Luke xi, 42 ; xiii, 10–16 ; xiv, 1–6 ; Mark ii, 23 ; iii, 5 ; xi, 16–17 ; xiii, 1–2.

[5] Matt. vi, 10, 33 ; Luke xi, 2.

continually exhorting His disciples with great earnestness to watch and be always ready to appear before the Supreme Judge.[1] Finally, He was inclined to take the fundamental principles of religion and morality for granted in view of the change of heart, being persuaded that if the heart were pure it would produce all the virtues, as a good tree bears good fruits.[2] Thus with profound psychological penetration He reduced all the Law and the Prophets to the love of God and of one's neighbour.[3]

To derogate from the value of this precept and others of a like nature, Jewish theologians have often pointed out that they are already contained in the Old Testament. This indeed is true,[4] but we must not fail to note one vast difference. There, the commandments to love God and one's neighbour are lost among a host of other secondary, or even purely ritual, injunctions, placed on a level with them. Jesus, on the other hand, reduces all the Law and the Prophets, all religion and morality to the love of God and one's neighbour, that is, to purity of heart, eliminating in this and other precepts everything which does not agree with it, and as a consequence, too, all that pious ritualism which played a dominant rôle in Judaism and stultified the effects of the most beautiful moral injunctions of Holy Writ.[5] Moreover, He follows up these fundamental principles of the Gospel to their natural results, teaching that even

[1] Matt. xxiv, 42–51; xxv, 1–13; Luke xii, 35–46; Mark xiii, 33–7.

[2] Matt. vii, 16–20; xii, 33–5; Luke vi, 43–5. Cf. Mark vii, 20–3.

[3] Mark xii, 28–34. Cf. Matt. vii, 12; Luke vi, 31.

[4] Deut. vi, 5; Lev. xix, 18.

[5] Cf. Weinel, § 14.

the inmost thoughts of the heart must be in conformity with the Divine Will, that all anger, hatred and evil speaking must be shunned, and that men should even love their enemies.[1] To the Jews in general it was enough if the moral conduct were correct, quite apart from the feelings which dictated it, and this was likely to promote a hypocritical Pharisaism. The irreconcilable conflict between this, the incarnation of Judaism, and Jesus' teaching, waged by the Pharisees with the greatest virulence until His death, affords sufficient proof that an entirely new spirit, incompatible with the fundamental basis of the Jewish idea, breathes in the Gospel message.

Believing the end of the world to be very close at hand, and profoundly convinced that it was necessary to love God above all things, Jesus regarded the love of the world and attachment to worldly possessions as the greatest obstacle to entry into the Kingdom of God. For this reason He combated this attachment with all the forces at His disposal.[2] This, too, is why He ardently disapproved of vain anxieties concerning the earthly life.[3] In the same order of ideas and with a similar end in view, He endeavoured to break the too pronounced ascendancy which family ties exercise over certain minds ; in this respect He

[1] Matt. v, 20, 43 et seq.

[2] Matt. vi, 19–21, 24 ; viii, 19–20 ; xiii, 44–6 ; xxii, 5 ; Luke vi, 24–5 ; ix, 57–8 ; xii, 16–21, 33–4 ; xiv, 33 ; xvi, 13, 19–26 ; Mark 36–7 ; x, 17–25. To judge aright a certain number of these texts in which Jesus seems to promise salvation to the poor alone, we must remember that in the Jewish language of the day, *poor* and *pious* are often synonymous : Bleek, Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien, i, pp. 227–8 ; Renan, Vie de Jésus, pp. 188–9 ; J. Weiss, pp. 127–32, 183–7 ; Krop, p. 44 et seq. ; Monnier, pp 140–3.

[3] Matt. vi, 25–34 ; Luke xii, 22–31.

went so far as to utter words which we may even think somewhat extreme.[1] He urged His disciples to yield themselves up, to follow Him on the path of suffering, to sacrifice their lives.[2] Some of these injunctions are only comprehensible from Jesus' eschatological point of view; they are evidently dictated by the expectation of a speedy end to the world.[3]

To be able entirely to account for this and avoid all exaggeration or error on the subject, we must however remember, too, that at a given moment there was a great outburst of hostility to Jesus and His work, and that this warned Him that His disciples would be obliged, like Himself, to make very great sacrifices in His cause. He did not require these of them at the very beginning of His ministry, doubtless, but only after He had resolved to go to Jerusalem, where great dangers awaited Him and His adherents. At first, indeed, He seems to have left Peter in possession of his house at Capernaum, and to have had His own home there.[4] It was during His journey to Jerusalem that He demanded of the rich man that he should give up all his possessions and follow Him.[5] And it was the sudden change which the demand effected in this man's attitude that induced Jesus' declaration concerning the difficulty the rich would

[1] Matt. viii, 21–2; x, 34–7; xix, 10–12; xxiv, 38–9; Luke ix, 59–62; xiv, 20, 26; Mark iii, 31–5; x, 29–30.

[2] Matt. v, 29–30; x, 38–9; xviii, 8–9; Luke xiv, 27; xvii, 33; Mark viii, 34–7; ix, 43, 45, 47; x, 38–9.

[3] J. Weiss, pp. 138–54; Krop, pp. 43–50; Holtzmann, Theologie· i, pp. 241 et seq.; Loisy, L'Evangile et l' Eglise, pp. 54–70; ibid., Synoptiques, i, pp. 234–6; Feine, pp. 159, 167 et seq.

[4] Mark i, 29–39.

[5] Mark x, 17 et seq.

have in entering the Kingdom of God.[1] It was also in this new and serious phase of His ministry that He imposed other very stringent demands upon His disciples.[2] He did not condemn riches and other earthly possessions in themselves, therefore, but in so far as they were hindrances to a complete consecration to the service of God.[3]

One clear proof that Jesus had not any excessively ascetic tendencies is the fact that, unlike John the Baptist,[4] He attached no importance to fasting; and another, that in condemning divorce[5] He defended the sacredness of the marriage tie.[6] The first apostles too, respected this tie, for they had not yet fallen into the error which shortly afterwards prevailed in the Church with regard to this matter.[7] Although Jesus renounced family life, and demanded the same sacrifice from others, it was not because He disdained such a life, but because, in the exceptional circumstances of those times,[8] a sacrifice of this nature seemed to Him necessary in the interests of the Kingdom of God. He laid stress upon the duty which children owed to their parents,[9] and the responsibilities of grown-up people to little children,[10] for whom He had a special affection.[11] As regards the State, science, art and culture in general, Jesus had no occasion to speak of them, so that it is useless to seek for either positive or negative pronouncements on such matters.[12]

[1] Mark x, 25.
[2] Luke ix, 57–62; xii, 51–3; xiv, 26; Mark viii; 34–8; Matt. viii, 19–22; x, 34–7.
[3] Cf. Weinel, pp. 59–60.
[4] Mark ii, 18–19; Matt. xi, 18–19; Luke v, 33–4.
[5] Mark x, 1–12; Matt. v, 31–2; 1 Cor. vii, 19.
[6] 1 Cor. ix, 5.
[7] Cf. Weinel, pp. 61–2, 104–5.
[8] Cf. Weinel, pp. 62–3.
[9] Mark vii, 9–13.
[10] Matt. xviii, 6; Luke xvii, 2; Mark ix, 42.
[11] Mark x, 13–16.
[12] Cf. Weinel, pp. 63–4.

If in the cases we have just mentioned the Gospel system has a markedly negative tendency, it assumes a more positive character when dealing with the duties of one man to another, and developing the practical consequences arising out of the second fundamental principle of the Gospel, the love of one's neighbour. This requires us to be pitiful and charitable,[1] forgiving and peaceable, pardoning others' offences, as God pardons our own ;[2] that we should love even our enemies and do good to them, that we may be perfect like God Himself.[3] In general we must do unto others as we would have them do to us.[4] We must live for others and serve them devotedly.[5] These are noble rules of conduct, applicable to all times and places. Here again, however, Jesus does not enter into detail, nor lose Himself in meticulous casuistry, but the scope of His precepts is all the more extensive.

Although He loudly proclaimed the love of God to be the supreme duty of man, He paid little attention to our other obligations towards God. Neither did He give Himself up to speculations concerning God, nor any special mysticism whatever. In this respect the authentic discourses of Jesus are in striking contrast with those attributed to Him in the Fourth Gospel. The Lord's Prayer, the pattern and example of Jesus' piety, is typical in its moderation in this respect.[6] Evangelical piety is, in fact, essentially ethical. If Jesus does not separate love of God

[1] Matt. v, 7, 42 ; Luke vi, 30, 36.

[2] Matt. v, 5, 9, 23–4 ; vi, 12–14 ; vii, 1–5 ; xviii, 21–35 ; Luke vi, 37–8, 41–2 ; xi, 4 ; xvii, 3–4 ; Mark xi, 25–6.

[3] Matt. v, 44–8 ; Luke vi, 27, 32–6.

[4] Matt. vii, 12 ; Luke vi, 31.

[5] Mark x, 42–4.

[6] Matt. vi, 9–13 ; Luke xi, 2–4.

from love of man,[1] He assuredly does not separate the service of the one from that of the other.[2] Although He regarded the human soul as of extraordinary value, considering it infinitely more precious than the life of the body which perishes or all the riches of this world,[3] it was not the soul and God, or their mutual relation, which formed the main object of His preaching, but the Kingdom of God, the new era and the company of saints who will live in it.[4] The Gospel, then, does not aspire to the salvation of individual souls only, but aims at creating a new humanity; thus its ends are collective and universal, as Christian socialists of our days recognize and rightly accentuate. It is individualist only in so far as it makes the salvation of each depend upon his own conduct.

2. Sin and Faith.

Since Jesus required repentance and conversion of all men before promising them salvation, He must have considered them all to be stained with sin. In His eyes God alone was perfectly good,[5] men in general being evil,[6] needing each day to ask for pardon of their sins, as for their daily bread.[7] When Our Lord speaks of just and good men,[8] therefore, He is using the words in a comparative sense only, denoting

[1] Mark xii, 31 and parallel passages. [2] Cf. Matt. xxv, 31–46.
[3] Matt. x, 28; xviii, 6, 14; Luke xii, 4; xvii, 2; Mark viii, 35–7.
[4] Loisy, L'Evangile et l'Eglise, pp. 33 et seq. [5] Mark x, 18.
[6] Matt. vii, 11; Luke xi, 13. Cf. Mark viii, 38; ix, 19; Matt. xii, 34, 39–41, 45; Luke ix, 41; xi, 29–31; xiii, 2–5.
[7] Matt. vi, 12, 14–15; Luke xi, 3–4; Mark xi, 25–6.
[8] Matt. v, 45; x, 41; xii, 35; xiii, 17; xxiii, 29, 35; Luke xv, 7; Mark ii, 13.

thereby men who are godly and devout. On the other hand, He does not fall into the doctrinaire exaggerations of the apostle Paul, who regards men in the mass as doomed to perdition. He really does distinguish between the good and the wicked, the just and the unjust among men, as we have just seen.[1] Far from believing a child, by virtue of original sin, to be as guilty and worthy of condemnation as a grown-up person, He uses it as an example to His hearers.[2] He extols all that is praiseworthy in the natural kindliness of fathers and mothers.[3] He discovers noble qualities in a Roman centurion, in a Canaanitish woman, in the Samaritans.[4] He assumes that there are men whose hearts are like fertile soil in which the Gospel can bring forth abundant fruit.[5] He believes that certain of His hearers possess the qualities which will enable them to enter the Kingdom of God.[6] He generally starts with the idea that the very greatest sinners may repent of their sins and return to God to obtain His pardon, like the Prodigal Son.[7] He presupposes that man possesses an inward light which may serve him as a guide, but which he must carefully cherish lest it be extinguished.[8]

Jesus, therefore, does not inquire into the origin of sin any more than He troubled to do in the case of the world. He formulates no system with regard to sin, nor as a general rule does He set up any theories whatever. In this as in other cases He pro-

[1] Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 218–9; Monnier, pp. 169–70; Feine, pp. 87–8; Weinel, pp. 162–5.
[2] Mark x, 14–15; Matt xviii, 3–4.
[3] Matt. vii, 9–10; Luke xi, 11–12.
[4] Matt. viii, 5–10; Mark vii, 24–30; Luke vii, 1–10; x, 30–7.
[5] Mark iv, 3–8. [6] Matt. v, 3–9. [7] Luke xv, 11 et seq.
[8] Matt. vi, 22–3; Luke xi, 34–5.

ceeds like an ordinary observer ascertaining the facts. Thus it is that He finds in the human heart the spring of good as well as of evil.[1] He may, too, have thought that Satan and his army of devils not only caused the diseases and other physical ills of mankind, but also exposed them to temptation and led them into sin.[2] To Him sin was, in the main, a moral disease needing cure just as much as a physical malady would do.[3] Man, however, might persist in evil and harden his heart, so that the truth revealed to him did not produce any salutary effect.[4] In Jesus' day this was the spiritual state of most of the Jews.[5]

In accordance with the views just stated, Jesus, like all of the Old Dispensation, believed that man was morally free, that he could choose between good and evil as long as he had not become entirely hardened in sin.[6] He therefore declares him to be always responsible for his actions and guilty of his transgressions, and that is why He announces that on the day of judgment everyone will be sentenced according to the good or ill that he has done in his lifetime.[7] There are, however, varying degrees of responsibility for man, according to the light vouchsafed him and the endowments he has received, and it is the same with regard to his culpability if he neglects his duty.[8]

[1] Matt. xii, 34–5 ; Luke vi, 45 ; Mark vii, 15, 20–3.

[2] Matt. iv, 1–11 ; xiii, 25, 38–9 ; Luke iv, 1–13 ; xxii, 3–6, 31–2 ; Mark i, 13 ; iv, 15.

[3] Mark ii, 17.

[4] Mark iv, 3–7.

[5] Matt. xi, 16–24 ; xii, 43–5 ; Luke vii, 31–5 ; x, 13–15 ; xi, 24–6.

[6] Matt. xxiii, 37 ; Luke xiii, 34.

[7] Matt. v, 20 ; vii, 13–14, 21–7 ; xviii, 8–9 ; xxiv, 45–51 ; xxv, 1–29 ; Luke vi, 46–9 ; x, 25–6 ; xii, 40–8 ; xiii, 3, 5, 25–7 ; xix, 12–25 ; Mark ix, 43, 45, 47 ; x, 17 et seq.

[8] Matt. v, 22 ; xi, 21–4 ; xxv, 14–30 ; Luke x, 13–15 ; xii, 47–8 ; xix, 12–25.

All sins of which a man repents, and which he renounces at once, will be pardoned save the sin against the Holy Spirit. This consists in consciously denying the Holy Spirit's influence and systematically rejecting the Kingdom of God.[1] Besides this, the setting of a bad example to others, especially to the "little ones", which causes them to stumble, is a particularly grave offence.[2]

* * * * *

Although Jesus regarded repentance of sins committed, a genuine change of sentiment and conduct, a life truly dedicated to God and lived in conformity with His will, as the essential condition of salvation, there is no absolutely genuine text in which He ever attributes the same importance to faith.[3] In general, He says very little about it, and in this respect the original historical Gospel presents the greatest possible contrast with Apostolic, and especially Pauline, theology. The latter, as we know, makes some degree of faith the sole condition of salvation, and moreover impresses upon it an entirely unique character or stamp, for it maintains as an essential the belief in Jesus Christ, and particularly that He died to atone for our sins, and rose again to give us full and complete assurance of this.[4]

On the other hand, we must admit that in the main faith plays a more important part in Jesus' preaching than at first sight appears; though frequently it is implied rather than expressly stated. The simplest

[1] Mark iii, 28–30.
[2] Matt. xviii, 6–7; Luke xvii, 1–2; Mark ix, 42.
[3] Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 301–4; Weinel, pp. 156–8.
[4] Piepenbring, Jésus et les Apôtres, p. 145 et seq., 164 et seq.

and truest summing-up of His teaching is undoubtedly contained in the words given in Matthew's Gospel: "Repent ye; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." [1] The stimulus and supreme incentive to repentance and amendment which Jesus never loses an opportunity of proclaiming, in the most varied forms, in all His discourses, therefore, is a faith or conviction that the Kingdom of God is at hand. This same faith is the moving principle of all His ministry and permeates it throughout. Therefore Mark is not, in the main, losing sight of Jesus' thought, when he renders the passage quoted as "The Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the Gospel" [2] although the last part may possibly have been inspired to some extent by Apostolic theology, as some of our modern exegetists believe.

Jesus' ethical standard, then, is not the result of dispassionate reflection, or theories about human nature and social life, but the outcome of a zealous faith, an ardent hope, an unwavering expectation that the old world with all its miseries and imperfections will pass away, and give place to the new, ideal world which Divine omnipotence will substitute in its stead. It rests, too, on the belief or certainty that everyone will have to account to God, the Supreme Judge, for all his actions, his whole conduct, even his inmost thoughts. This conception of the judgment, which permeates the whole Gospel like that of the Kingdom of God, from which it is inseparable, moreover involves faith in the infallible justice of God, just as the pardon which Jesus proclaims to all penitent sinners, involves faith in the compassionate love of God. This faith is to be found, unexpressed,

[1] Matt. iv, 17. [2] Mark i, 15.

in the prayer of the Prodigal Son, and in that of the Publican, the one asking pardon of his father, the symbol of the Heavenly Father, the other beseeching it of God Himself.[1]

Here are the few Gospel passages in which Jesus speaks explicitly of faith. The centurion at Capernaum having made proof of unusual faith in asking Jesus to heal his servant, Our Lord remarked: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."[2] Having stilled the tempest which had so terrified the disciples, Jesus said to them: "Why are ye so fearful? How is it that ye have no faith?"[3] It is related that on another occasion He said: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove."[4] So, too, He once considered His hearers as men "of little faith", seeing that they lacked trust in God respecting their livelihood.[5] How vast is the difference between this simple faith and that of Apostolic theology, in the first place, and of ecclesiastical scholasticism in particular! We might say that faith in the advent of the Kingdom, faith in the compassionate love of God for all penitent sinners, and faith in the Divine justice which will be manifest in the last judgment, were cardinal points in Jesus' discourses, as they will ever be in Christian preaching. We must however point out that in no text that is of undoubted authenticity did Jesus make faith in general, or a specific faith, the means or condition of eternal salvation.

[1] Luke xv, 18–21; xviii, 13.
[2] Matt. viii, 10; Luke vii, 9.
[3] Mark iv, 40.
[4] Matt. xvii, 20; Luke xvii, 6
[5] Matt. vi, 30; Luke xii, 28.

3. Eudæmonism and Jesus' Ideal.

One feature of Jesus' teaching which offends the Protestant sense is that in it salvation is sometimes pictured as a reward.[1] This point of view is the outcome of the Jewish conception of religion, according to which there is a covenant between God and Israel, imposing mutual obligations upon both the contracting parties. The part which man must play in order to win salvation is compared by Jesus with a task completed, a contract carried through, service rendered, which merits reward.[2] In many passages and in widely differing forms this idea recurs.[3] On the other hand, the Divine blessings are not strictly measured according to human deserts, but far surpass them.[4] Generally speaking, Jesus does not seem to have laid as much stress upon the idea of reward as Matthew's Gospel with its Judeo-Christian tendency would have us believe.[5] This is seen in a parable which His Gospel passes over in silence, doubtless because it does not tally with that tendency, but teaches that the servant who has fulfilled his duty faithfully has no claim to special reward.[6]

If the idea of reward, accentuated in the Gospel, has always proved an embarrassment to Protestant

[1] Matt. v, 12, 46; x, 41–2; Luke vi, 23, 33–4; Mark ix, 41.

[2] Matt. xx, 1 et seq.; xxiv, 45–51; xxv, 14–28; Luke xii, 42–6; xix., 12–25.

[3] Matt. v, 5, 7, 25–6; vi. 14–15; vii, 1–2; x, 32–3, 39; xviii, 23–35; xix, 28–9; xxiii, 12; Luke vi, 37–8; xii, 8–9, 58–9; xiv, 11–14; xvii, 33; xviii, 14; xxiii, 28–30; Mark viii, 38; x, 29–30; xi, 25-6.

[4] Matt. xix, 29; xx, 8–15; xxiv, 46–7; xxv, 20–3; Luke xii, 37, 43–4; xviii, 29–30; Mark x, 28–30.

[5] Mark vi, 1–18.

[6] Luke xvii, 7–10. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 158.

theology,[1] it is easy to see why this should be so, for the theory of salvation by grace alone, professed by the apostle Paul,[2] as well as its corollary, salvation through faith, became the fundamental doctrine of Protestantism, and this doctrine seems hardly to accord with the teaching of Jesus just noted, which appears to countenance merit through works. It therefore required extraordinary adroitness to arrive at any semblance of agreement between the two divergent doctrinal types, such as the older dogmatism demanded. In this respect, too, Jesus and Paul really followed different paths, and this we must recognize at once, instead of making painstaking efforts to elaborate and harmonize a hybrid system which is contrary to historical truth. History teaches us that Jesus strongly opposed the Judaism of the Pharisees, which reduced salvation to a mere bargain or contract; and to this end He loudly proclaimed the merciful love of God and His free pardon of sinful and repentant man.[3] But if this is indeed true, it is no less certain that according to the whole of Jesus' teaching, man must also effectually contribute to his salvation by breaking with evil and dedicating himself truly to the service of God.

From another point of view, if we were to attribute ordinary eudæmonism to Jesus, we should wholly fail to appreciate His undeniable idealism and heroism. As He was neither a theorist nor a doctrinaire who aimed at formulating an absolutely complete religious and moral system, but a man of the people with no end in view but practical piety, He

[1] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 258–65.
[2] Piepenbring, Jésus et les Apôtres, p. 183 et seq
[3] Luke xv, 11–32; xviii, 9–14; Matt. xx, 1–15.

frequently used the language current among the Jews on this topic.[1] If we go further into the matter we at once ascertain that not only did He break with eudæmonism,[2] but that the ideal of good which dominated Him throughout His ministry, and the heroism which led Him to devote Himself unreservedly to the sacred cause He had espoused, stand out at all times, both in His exhortations and in His conduct. Here are some characteristic sayings of His : "Every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."[3] . . . "Swear not at all. . . . But let your speech be Yea, yea ; Nay, nay."[4] . . . "No man can serve two masters."[5] . . . "Enter ye in by the narrow gate."[6] . . . "If thy hand or thy foot causeth thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee. . . . And if thine eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out and cast it from thee."[7] "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."[8] . . . "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein."[9] In these and many other traits there is nothing traditional or conventional ; they are the spontaneous expression of ardent and profound personal feeling combined with the energy and will-power which can put such precepts into practice. They betray, moreover, considerable acumen and very delicate moral judgment, and this, too, we note elsewhere. We have an example of it when Jesus says : "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy

[1] Weinel, pp. 108–11.
[2] Ibid., pp. 127–9.
[3] Matt. v, 28.
[4] Matt. v, 34, 37.
[5] Matt. vi, 24 ; Luke xvi, 13.
[6] Matt. vii, 13 ; Luke xiii, 24.
[7] Matt. xviii, 8–9 ; Mark ix, 43, 45, 47.
[8] Luke ix, 62.
[9] Mark x, 15.

brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"[1] Or again: "Every one that putteth away his wife . . . maketh her an adulteress; and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery."[2] Let us note, too, His appreciation of the widow's offering,[3] and the words addressed to the accusers of the woman taken in adultery: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her."[4]

In all these cases and many others we might mention, Jesus does not allow Himself to be guided by any consideration of the consequences, either temporal or eternal, of human actions, but solely by the lofty ideal He had before Him. This ideal, which drew Him from the carpenter's bench and forced Him to enter upon a ministry fruitful of anxieties and dangers, was communicated to the most earnest of His hearers and made disciples of them, despite the very hard conditions which He imposed upon them.[5] And the same influence is still produced on all the hearts of the well-disposed who submit to it. We must therefore impress upon our minds that the eudæmonism expressed in many of Jesus' sayings is language that has been borrowed; it is derived from His Jewish surroundings, but it is imbued with a personal feeling which we must carefully note.[6]

Another important conclusion arises out of this. If we try to interpret the whole Gospel by Jesus' eschatology without paying due attention to His individuality, as Loisy has done, we lose sight of the most influential factor in the Gospel story, and we

[1] Matt. vii, 3; Luke vi, 41.
[2] Luke xvi, 18; Matt. v, 32.
[3] Mark xii, 41–4.
[4] John viii, 7.
[5] Matt. viii, 19–22; Luke ix, 57–62.
[6] Weinel, § 19.

do not possess the right key to its most original parts. Thus we are persuaded that if that eminent critic was right in correcting Harnack for having, like many others, undervalued the great importance of eschatology in the discourses of Jesus, he went to the other extreme in reducing all or nearly all of Jesus' doctrine to the announcement of the advent of the Kingdom of God.[1] And yet Jesus, unlike the writers of most of the Jewish and Christian apocalypses, never attempted any description of this kingdom. On the contrary, the points on which He lays marked stress, and develops most, in all His exhortations, are the conditions of salvation. He is for ever telling His hearers in the most insistent fashion what they must do or leave undone in order to enter the Kingdom of God. This forms the chief subject of His teaching, and He reiterates it in every way and with a clearness of diction which leaves nothing to be desired. It is, too, the most original portion of the Gospel, and in it we can best enter into Jesus' thought. Doubtless this was the reason which led Him explicitly to compare His mission with that of Jonah, the typical preacher of repentance.[2] The prediction of the coming Kingdom of God usually serves only as a point of departure for the exposition of all that relates to this cardinal feature of the Gospel.

If the statement of the essential conditions of salvation largely predominates in Jesus' authentic teaching, these features stand out, moreover, by reason of their superior, permanent qualities. We have but to recall all those traits which show that

[1] Loisy, L'Evangile et l'Eglise, pp. 33 et seq.; Synoptiques, i, pp. 225 et seq. Cf. Piepenbring, Harnack et Loisy.

[2] Matt. xii, 39, 41; Luke xi, 30–1.

godliness consists in purity of the heart and not of the hands or of the cup; in deeds of love and devotion, not in outward observances; in dedication to the service of one's fellows, especially those who are suffering, not in withdrawal from the world; in pity for those who have fallen, not in Pharisaic self-sufficiency; in qualities which are simply human, not in an exaggeration of piety; in virtues which embrace the whole of life and are the concern of all men, not in ritual acts in exceptional circumstances. By virtue of this Jesus soared above the excessively conventional Judaism of His times and administered a mortal blow to the superficial ritualism of the ancient world in general. By virtue of this He became a real reformer in the religious sphere, and His beneficent influence on the hearts of men will never cease. And since His noblest exhortations and precepts are but the expression of His personal thoughts and feelings, they enable us to estimate aright His exalted spiritual standard and bear witness to the ideal intensity and depth of His inner life.

The expectation of the speedy end of the world and the advent of the Kingdom of God had already inspired the prophets of old, and especially the writers of the Jewish apocalypses, though it had not produced the sublime standard of the Gospel ethics. Let us take the Johannine revelation as an example. No book in the Bible is more influenced by eschatology than this. Why then do we find in it an entirely different spirit from that of Jesus' Gospel: the ardent desire for vengeance on the enemies of the Christian faith, an extreme delight in scenes of carnage and bloodshed, so many other exaggerated features which are neither evangelical nor edifying? It is because

eschatology *per se* is absolutely unable to yield good thoughts and noble sentiments. To produce such, there must be a pure and generous spirit, uninfluenced in its action by the prospect of another world to come. To sum up, we may say therefore that the eschatology of Jesus only affected the form of His teaching, and a part of that teaching only. As for its essential foundation (to which Loisy himself at times draws attention),[1] it was the result of His own inner life. In our opinion the great omission of the distinguished Parisian professor in this matter seems to be that he has not realized the importance of *the personal factor* as an element of Jesus' influence. He has directed his attention too exclusively to the consideration of the external circumstances of Jesus' ministry, but has not realized its deeper source.

[1] Synoptiques, i, pp 232–4.

CHAPTER IV

THE GOD OF THE GOSPELS

1. The Teaching of Jesus.

Since the concept of a deity is the cardinal point and specially characteristic feature of all religions, it is the same with the Christian God. For that reason the exposition of Jesus' doctrine usually starts with the idea of the Heavenly Father which looms so largely throughout the Gospels and appears to be the basis and foundation of a great reform in religious thought. We have not proceeded thus, however, because our earlier chapters have shewn that in the first place it was Jesus' aim to proclaim the near approach of the Kingdom of God and to set forth the conditions of salvation which must be fulfilled in order to enter it and be saved. Another reason, too, has influenced us in this matter. It is that Our Lord, dominated by the expectation of the speedy end of the world, did not prosecute a religious or ecclesiastical reform properly so-called (as people so long have imagined and in many circles continue to imagine), but that any such reform was simply the outcome of His lofty ideals and conduct. We have shewn that from the very beginning it was not His intention to amend the Old Testament, though this belief was

long held, and still obtains credence.[1] If He actually did become a great and true reformer, then, it was without any express desire of being such. We shall see, moreover, that with respect to the concept of the Heavenly Father, our Gospels require certain emendations.

For the better appreciation of Jesus' part in the conception of God, let us recall the principal features of this conception among the Israelites and in the very heart of Judaism. To Ancient Israel its extremely exclusive God Jahweh had at the same time a popular and anthropomorphic character, whilst it was the greater prophets alone who subsequently imparted a more ideally ethical and universal aspect to the conception of Him.[2] In later Judaism, on the other hand, the idea of God grew ever more theoretical, transcendental and speculative. So pronounced was this transcendental trend that man was considered incapable of really comprehending God and expressing what He actually was. Consequently men no longer even uttered the name of Jahweh, and usually spoke of God in the most abstract terms. They went so far as to believe that God could not enter into direct relation with the world and mankind save by means of intermediaries alone, by His Spirit, His Name, His Glory, His Word, His Wisdom, all of which they personified.[3]

In face of such an abstract and speculative current of thought, the popular preaching of Jesus forms a

[1] Vide infra, chap. i, § 3.

[2] Piepenbring, Théologie, §§ 8, 9, 27; ibid., Histoire, pp. 240–9, 303–5.

[3] Bousset, pp. 347–67, 394–409; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 52–7, 68–74; Felten, ii, pp. 29–42; Bertholet, pp. 359–73, 393–5.

strong contrast and assumes a reformative character. Yet He himself doubtless would fail to take this fully into account, for He seems to have been unaware of the Rabbinical movement we have mentioned, a movement which dominated the theological circles only. He, on the contrary, had always lived in the midst of the populace and in the main shared its chief ideas, all the more so because His spiritual sustenance was principally the reading of the Psalms and the best of the prophetical books of the Old Testament, expressed for the most part in the language of Israel of old, within the comprehension of every Jew. His ideas, therefore, would centre mainly, though not entirely, upon the God of the Scriptures and of tradition.

Another fact should be noted here. If the Jewish theologians, giving themselves up to abstruse and subtle speculations concerning the nature of God, indulged in a train of thought which robbed the religion of their fathers of its simplicity, the people also were influenced by certain fresh movements, notably by the belief in the ministry of angels and demons, which was for the most part imported into Judaism from foreign sources. Demonology, in particular, spread rapidly among the Jews while under the Persian rule and subject to its influence.[1] Both angelology and demonology having penetrated to the very midst of the Jewish people at the time of Jesus, made a profound impression upon them, as indeed we have already seen in the case of the latter.[2] If Jesus considered it the chief task of His ministry

[1] Piepenbring, Théologie, §28–9; Bousset, chap. xvi–xvii; Holtzmann, i, pp. 57–63; Felten, ii, pp. 70–103; Bertholet, pp. 374–93.

[2] Vide infra, pp. 33–4.

to proclaim the near approach of the Kingdom of God, it was because He desired with His whole heart and soul to overthrow the rule of Satan, and substitute that of God.[1]

When we consider attentively the genuine statements made by Jesus about God, we soon see that He explicitly declared His belief in the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the sole ruler of heaven and earth, the great King who alone is perfectly good.[2] Since God is thus the sovereign Master of the world, men must be His humble and obedient servants, as Jesus never ceases telling them over and over again, especially in certain of His parables.[3] He regards God as governing the whole world, even in its most insignificant details.[4] He knows our inmost feelings, even before we are aware of them ourselves.[5] He terminates our life on earth when it pleases Him.[6] He is able to destroy body and soul in Gehenna.[7] He will execute judgment rigorously upon all who shew themselves disobedient to His will.[8] All these and similar characteristics are in complete conformity with the primary idea of God in the Old Testament, where He is continually presented in many widely differing forms as an essentially just God who rewards every one according to his deserts.

But the God of Jesus is not merely just; He is

[1] Vide infra, i, p. 44.

[2] Mark xii, 26, 29; x, 18; Matt. v, 34–5, 48; xi, 25; Luke vi, 35–6; xi, 21.

[3] Matt. xviii, 23 et seq.; xx, 1 et seq.; xxv, 14 et seq.

[4] Matt. v, 45; vi, 28–30; x, 29–30; Mark x, 27; xiv, 36; Luke xii, 6–7, 24.

[5] Matt. vi, 8; Luke xvi, 15.

[6] Luke xii, 20.

[7] Matt. x, 28; Luke xii, 5.

[8] Matt. v, 21–6; vii, 21–7; Luke vi, 46–9; xii, 58–9; xiii, 27–8.

also, and above all, good, a point which the Old Testament does not overlook, but upon which it lays little stress. In the Scriptures, moreover, God's goodness often appears to be very exclusive in its tendency, and exercised wholly in favour of Israel, not manifested towards mankind in general. In the Gospel view of it, however, the love of God is vastly more extended, and if its particularism is not entirely obliterated therein, in some passages at least it is lacking, and considerably subdued in others.

It has often been thought that the name of "Father", so frequently used for God in the discourses of Jesus, was a visible sign distinguishing the religion of the Gospel from all others. But this is not so. We have already seen that the Jews gave the name of Father to their God, and it is the same in many other ancient religions. Moreover, the Evangelists have put this name into the mouth of Jesus far more often than it actually was uttered; they have also formulated it in their own way in many cases, notably in the First and the Fourth Gospels. Now here we find ourselves confronted with data which are of later growth and of doubtful authenticity. These same Gospels often portray Jesus using the words "My Father" in speaking of God, so that they may reserve the title of "Son of Man" exclusively for Him. Such characteristics betray the influence of the Apostolic Christology. John's anti-Judaism even led him to maintain that God is in no way the Father of the Jews, who have the Devil for their father.[1] In this respect the original, authentic Gospel must be carefully distinguished from its later forms.[2]

[1] John viii, 38–44.

[2] For details, consult Weinel, pp. 130–5. Cf. infra, p. 42.

The title of Father, often given to God by Jesus, already proves that He considered Him chiefly as a God of love, and this first impression is moreover confirmed by many details set forth in the Gospels. We may first note the fact that Jesus, following the example of certain of the Psalms, extends the Fatherly love of God and His providential care to all His creation, even in the most insignificant circumstances of life, so that His children may be raised above worldly cares.[1] Again, He lays special stress upon God's compassionate love towards sinful and repentant man, as is most clearly expressed in the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Silver, and the Prodigal Son.[2] The parable of the Husbandmen hired at different hours of the day also shews that the goodness of God exceeds justice pure and simple.[3] If the Old Testament does already contain some fine passages on the pitying love of God and His pardon of sinful and penitent man, they are nevertheless somewhat isolated cases, whilst God's unwavering justice, His severity and even His anger are accentuated in innumerable instances. This is the reason why the fear, and not the love, of God is the feeling which dominates Israelitish godliness.

It is evident that it is in what we have just been considering, that we can best discern Jesus' fresh and personal outlook. In the passages in which He speaks of the impartial justice of God, who recompenses every man according to his deeds, on the other hand, He is but echoing the current ideas of the Judaism in which He was brought up. It is, then, the affirmation of the Fatherly love of God which consti-

[1] Matt. vi, 25–34; x, 29–31; Luke xii, 6–7, 22–30.
[2] Luke xv; Matt. xviii, 12–14. [3] Matt. xx, 1–16.

tutes the essence of the authentic Gospel, and is the most direct response to the spiritual need of all who take into account our true position with regard to the thrice holy God. For God alone is supremely good,[1] whilst men are guilty sinners. There is not one among even the best of them who is perfect, not a single one.[2] But God, who maketh the sun to rise, and sendeth rain upon the evil and the good indiscriminately,[3] surpasses the bounds of strict justice, for He is full of love and compassion for all sinners who repent and are troubled in mind on account of their sinful state.

We ought to add that Jesus expresses these consoling and cheering views without any thought or theory of expiation, for all features of that sort have been added under the influence of Apostolic theology.[4] Nevertheless Our Lord is deeply convinced of the compassionate love of God and His pardon of all penitent sinners, as we see from His whole conduct, and from His treatment of the woman taken in adultery,[5] and other instances already mentioned. Thus He attributes to God His own noble and generous sentiments. Allowing Himself to be guided, not by merely logical concepts and reasoning, but by His own personal ideals and impressions, He feels no need to try and reconcile His Jewish, traditional ideas about Divine justice with the Gospel conception of the pardon of God ; He contents Himself with placing the two side by side, which is quite natural. For Divine justice is postulated throughout the Old

[1] Mark x, 18.
[2] Matt. vi, 12 ; vii, 11 ; Luke xi, 4, 13.
[3] Matt. v, 45 ; Luke vi, 35.
[4] Cf. Piepenbring, Christologie, pp. 106 et seq.
[5] John viii, 1–11.

Testament, which speaks with the voice of authority for Him, and the notion of the compassionate love of God, also to be found there, naturally re-echoes loudly in His loving heart.

Since the Pharisees' ideas of merit or demerit were based mainly upon purely external practices, Jesus felt constrained to resist this superficial tendency which opened wide the doors to hypocrisy, to piety which was in appearance only, and to other spiritual excesses. He must have been encouraged in this course by the fact that the books of the greatest prophets, and the most sublime of the Psalms, already preluded drastic reform of the religious formalism, as we know.[1] Jesus engaged all the more readily in such resistance since crowds of the lower orders of the people were actually unable to observe all the complicated and often costly multiplicity of rules imposed by priests, scribes, and Pharisees on all who, according to official standards, would be truly devout. He had compassion on these crowds of wandering sheep, without true and kindly shepherds,[2] and His heart and conscience prompted Him to become their spiritual guide and the physician of their souls.[3]

His words and actions thus accentuating the Fatherly and pitying love of God, He awoke in their hearts trust and confidence in HIM, and thus faith in the free pardon of the God of love became the fundamental principle of the godliness which was truly evangelical. Nothing in Jesus' life strikes us more forcibly than His full and complete faith, His boundless and perfect confidence in God, His abso-

[1] Vide infra, chap. i, § 3.
[2] Mark vi, 34; Matt. ix, 36.
[3] Mark ii, 17.

lute surrender to His Heavenly Father. He has no hesitation in expecting everything from Him, and these ideas of His have a contagious effect upon others. It was doubtless the filial attitude which so dominated Him that led Him to present children, wholly confident of their parents' love, as perfect types of evangelical godliness.[1]

2. The Consequences of Jesus' Teaching.

Since God is the Father of all who cleave to Him and seek to do His will, they are His children [2] and brethren one to another.[3] They may rest assured, not only that His Kingdom will come, but also that He will give them their daily bread and forgive them their sins.[4] We know already that Jesus' main consideration was the fulfilment of the first of these desires, and He was fully persuaded that God would shortly enter upon that reign which was to be so glorious and beneficent for His children,[5] and that while they were awaiting it He would take them under His care and provide for them with true Fatherly solicitude.

This idea of Providential care, as conceived and expounded by Jesus, rendered both angelology and demonology of no importance whatever. The transcendental Deity of the Jews having been replaced by a Heavenly Father, full of compassion and solicitude for men, and for all created beings, the mediation of angels would no longer be necessary. And since Jesus

[1] Mark x, 13–16; Matt. xviii, 1–14.
[2] Matt. v, 9, 45; Luke vi, 35.
[3] Matt. v, 22–4; viii, 3–5; xviii, 15, 21, 35; xxv, 40; Luke vi, 41–2; xvii, 3.
[4] Luke xi, 2–4; Matt. vi, 10–12. [5] Vide infra, chap. ii.

at the same time insisted upon the sovereign power of God, who would shortly overthrow that of Satan entirely, the terrors inspired by the latter and his army of demons were also dispelled. Whilst not denying the Jewish conception of the sphere of angels and of demons, Jesus therefore virtually nullified or considerably diminished the part they played. Through His own profoundly religious life He could revert to the simple and sane piety of the great prophets who had felt no need of intermediaries between God and man, but attributed all that occurred to the direct intervention of God.

In another respect Jesus' piety was a reversion to that of the great prophets of old. He was profoundly convinced that God was actually present in the world in spite of all its miseries and imperfections. According to Him, God's influence could be traced in nature and in the life of all men ; He extended His care to all created beings and to the world at large. Within the fold of Judaism, on the contrary, people were more and more inclined to believe that the thrice holy God held this world at a distance or had even abandoned it entirely, as unworthy of His protection. This gave rise to the pronounced apocalyptic tendency of Judaism, which looked for no salvation but the annihilation of the world of their day and the substitution of an entirely different one. This, too, was the source of the strong tide of asceticism among the Jews, and the withdrawal from the world, as instanced by the Essenes and John the Baptist. Without in any way breaking with Jewish eschatology, Jesus nevertheless amended the exaggerations we have noted, preaching to His race, at that time disposed to believe themselves forsaken of God, of a

Deity who was loving and active, guarding, protecting, and ever showering blessings upon all who trusted in Him,—caring for them as a father for his children.

Let us add, too, that the need for pardon could not obtain full and entire satisfaction under the Old Dispensation, because the holiness and justice of their God was too exclusively the predominating feature of both Hebrew and Jewish religion. Without directly abolishing the rule of the Law, Jesus brought forward the Gospel, the good news, not only that the Kingdom of God was close at hand with its impending judgment, but that it was possible to escape the severity of that judgment by becoming reconciled to God while yet there was time. Thus without in any way detracting from the holiness and justice of God, He followed up these ideas to advantage, making God's Fatherly and pitiful love the mainspring of His Gospel. Henceforth the sinner need no longer despair of salvation through fear of God and His judgment, which had been the case under the Law with certain chosen souls whose consciences were peculiarly sensitive.[1] The evangelical principle laid down by Jesus, on the contrary, could reassure the greatest sinners, and permit of their approaching God in full and entire confidence that He does not desire the death of a sinner, but His conversion and eternal life.

Here it is that the Gospel reaches its culminating point, in that it lays the foundation of a religion which is pre-eminently one of redemption, and above all, that it affords present and direct satisfaction to sincere godliness. Only on this condition could godliness retain its force and durability. It was this

[1] Rom. vii, 12–24.

condition which was most lacking to the ancient Jews, however. Looking, as they did, too closely at historical occurrences and political situations to perceive God's ways, and His plans for them, they were depressed beyond measure at their lamentable state. External conditions could reveal to them nothing of the Fatherly love and care of God ; these spoke only of His wrath, and their present outlook was so gloomy that they had a sharp sense of having been abandoned.

To the Jewish world, thus feeling itself, as it were, forsaken of God, or at any rate removed to a long distance by multitudes of angels and demons, Jesus revealed God quite near at hand, both in nature and in the soul of man. He showed that God's love and providential care were already in the present being manifested towards man and all creation, and that His compassion secured pardon for every humble and contrite sinner. He made them envisage a God who was not enthroned in inaccessible isolation, or indifferent to His people except in a dim and uncertain future, but One whose heart felt tenderly towards them, Who was not far from any one of His children, and was watching over them with special solicitude.

To the extent that Jesus upheld the Jewish idea of the Kingdom of God, salvation would doubtless also appear to be mainly prospective, and if He had foretold nothing else, His Gospel would be shorn of much of its value, since the Messianic hopes were not actually realized. But since He did not look solely around Him and consider the external conditions of His nation alone, but also within Himself, He found there direct and immediate witness to the love of God, which flooded His soul with peace and joy

ineffable. Thus He had but to communicate to others His personal experience to procure for them, too, inward happiness and the conviction of present salvation. In this way He postulated a theory of godliness which all can already enjoy, and which does not depend in any way upon time or place. This it is which gives Evangelical godliness its permanent value, which stamps it with a genuinely religious and moral impress, and renders it independent of all metaphysical and apocalyptic theory.

* * * * *

The revelation of God's Fatherly love and the genuinely ethical conditions propounded by Jesus entail other important consequences which we must note. We have seen that as a result of God's condescending love towards man, the latter no longer needs an intermediary if he desires to approach his Heavenly Father, and therefore the ministry of angels loses much of its importance or even the very reason for its existence. But from the moment that man has free access to God he no longer needs the priesthood to bring him into relation with Him, and the Gospel expressly tends to free the child of God from all human tutelage whatever.[1]

Although Jesus did nothing towards abolishing the Jewish priesthood, any more than He made any general attempt to put an end to the Old Covenant (believing, as He did, that this would be an inevitable result of the advent of the Kingdom of God [2]), He nevertheless entered upon a course which naturally tended to deprive external observances (and, as a

[1] Mark x, 42–4; Matt. xxiii, 8–11.
[2] Luke xvi, 16; Matt. xi, 12–13.

consequence, the priestly orders) of their importance. Not only had He no sympathy with the Pharisees, but He combated them vigorously. He seems besides to have had little esteem or liking for the Sadducees, who at that time formed the priestly party in Jerusalem. For disciples He chose simple laymen, and the religious faith He inculcated was also genuinely laic, as free from ritual as from theological dogma. He set reconciliation between brethren and filial devotion to parents higher than acts of worship,[1] and He did not hesitate to foretell the ruin of the Temple at Jerusalem.[2] In His eyes the worship of God mainly consisted in living a life of love in conformity with God's will. To please the thrice holy God and obtain His blessing one must be pure in heart and one's conduct must be in accordance with that ideal, as we noted in the opening paragraph of this chapter. In this respect Jesus did no more than follow the great prophets of Israel, who had already loudly proclaimed that the practice of justice and of virtue in general was better than the sacrifice of blood and all other ritual acts. Adopting and developing in His own fashion, that is, according to the Gospel principles, what the seers of old had preached with regard to this, and combating the empty formalism of the Jewish worship of His day, He established worship in spirit and in truth, which has, alas, not been sufficiently maintained in the Churches themselves even to this day.

We may well say that Jesus, in proclaiming that God is a true Father who bestows His blessings on the good and on the evil and pardons the vilest of sinners, provided only that they repent of their sins

[1] Matt. v, 23–4; Mark vii, 10–12. [2] Mark xiii, 1–2; xiv. 58.

and forsake their former ways, changed the very pivot and basis of ancient religion, both Jewish and Pagan. The predominating feature of such religion was the fear of their deities. The best summing-up of the whole of the Old Testament, as finally expressed in the official Judaism of Jerusalem, is contained in the words from Ecclesiastes: "Fear God and keep His commandments; for that is the whole duty of man."[1] The fear of Divine chastisement and the anxiety to avoid it and to obtain Divine favour, were the motive forces of allegiance, both in ancient Israel and among other nations. That is the reason why piety in general, apart from Evangelical religion, has produced only servile obedience and has proved incapable of rendering man truly happy. It has moreover been chiefly manifested in the assiduous accomplishment of all ceremonial worship, and particularly in the offering of abundant sacrifices. Ritualism and servility are characteristic features of the ancient religions, and of all inferior ones. That which essentially distinguishes the Gospel of Jesus, causing it to transcend all others, is that it tends most to transform the naturally selfish heart of man, the origin of all vice, into a new heart, loving and devoted, imbued with love to God and the spirit of brotherhood, and influenced by the Fatherly love of God to all His children. In this respect Jesus inaugurated a new era. If the external transformation of the world, expected and predicted by Him and by the Jews, did not take place, at any rate He laid the foundation for a transformation or renewal important in another respect, the regeneration of the moral world.

[1] Eccles. xii, 15.

CHAPTER V

A NEW PHASE IN JESUS' MINISTRY

1. The Hostility of the Jews and the Goodwill of Others.

The course of Jesus' ministry was not smooth and uniform, but subject to many sudden turns. It contained not successes only, but also reverses and disappointments. He soon found Himself face to face with the indifference of the masses and the hostility of their leaders. Although He was dominated throughout by the thought of the imminent advent of the Kingdom of God and the urgent need for each to fulfil the conditions necessary to enter therein, Jesus' opinions could not follow an undeviating line in all respects, but underwent certain modifications under the influence of changing circumstances. If we overlook these variations and treat all that concerns His public ministry in the same way, we shall be presenting the facts of the case imperfectly, or even in a false light. This has happened only too often in the past.

We know then, that at first Jesus still shared the Jews' ideas of their nation as a peculiarly favoured people,[1] but later on, as we shall see, He changed

[1] Vide infra, p. 48 et seq.

His opinion in this respect. Evidently it was the sad experiences acquired during His ministry which occasioned the change of view. Although in the beginning He was surrounded and followed from place to place by vast and enthusiastic crowds, especially on account of the cures He effected, He Himself was not desirous of playing the part of thaumaturgist, and was much more concerned to bring about a real change of heart.[1] From the very start, therefore, there was a certain variance between the lofty and fundamentally ethical aims of Jesus and the standards of the populace, eager above all for that which was marvellous, and for the realization of all their earthly dreams. This variance seems to have gone on steadily increasing, and at last Jesus came to the sad conclusion that His ministry had not produced the results He had anticipated, and He began severely to upbraid the cities which had been the chief witness of it, and had not profited thereby to repent of their sins.[2] Many there were who called Him Lord! Lord! but made no effort to conform with His teaching and only deserved His stern reproof.[3] For trivial reasons or from purely material interests they refused the invitation to the Great Marriage Supper.[4] They could discern "the face of the heaven", foretelling rain or fair weather, but not the signs of the times announcing salvation or perdition.[5] The Gospel seed fell not only upon good ground, but yet more abundantly upon the rocky

[1] Matt. xii, 38–9; xvi, 4; Luke xi, 16, 29–32.
[2] Matt. xi, 20–4; Luke x, 12–15; cf. iv, 24 et seq.
[3] Matt. vii, 21–7; viii, 11–12; Luke vi, 46–9; xiii, 26–30.
[4] Matt. xxii, 1 et seq.; Luke xiv, 16 et seq.
[5] Matt. xvi, 1–3; Luke xii, 54–7.

soil where it withered away.[1] The Jewish people behaved like foolish children; they failed to profit by either the ministry of John the Baptist or that of Jesus, but put forward all sorts of excuses to evade any obligation.[2] They were like an evil and adulterous generation, which would be condemned at the judgment day.[3] Their condition resembled that of a man possessed of a devil, who had been once cured and then had fallen back into a state worse than the first.[4] There was but a short time left them for repentance; if they did not profit by it they were doomed to perish like the Galileans slain by Pilate or the people upon whom the tower of Siloam fell; they might expect to be destroyed like an unfruitful tree.[5] Jesus finally came to the conclusion that only the few would enter by the strait gate and find salvation.[6]

The leaders of the Jewish people, chiefly the scribes and Pharisees, not only did not avail themselves of the ministry of Jesus, but most strenuously opposed Him. They were particularly disturbed and offended by the following facts. Jesus ate with publicans and sinners.[7] He did not observe the customary strict rules with regard to the Sabbath, nor did His disciples, and He even dared to heal the sick upon that day.[8] Neither did He pay any heed to the tradition of the elders concerning the Levitical rites of purification, but urged God's ethical laws against the

[1] Mark iv, 3–9.
[2] Matt. xi, 16–19; Luke vii, 31–5.
[3] Luke xi, 29–32; Matt. xii, 39, 41–2.
[4] Matt. xii, 43–5; Luke xi, 24–6.
[5] Luke xiii, 1–9.
[6] Luke xiii, 24 et seq.; xii, 32; Matt. vii, 13–14.
[7] Mark ii, 15–17; Luke vii, 36 et seq.; xv, 1–2.
[8] Mark ii, 23–iii, 5; Luke xiii, 10–16.

8524

ceremonial tradition. He even went so far as to condemn the traditions of the Pharisees as a whole, and to maintain the heterodox theory that nothing which man ate could defile him, since the only real offences were evil thoughts and words, and deeds of iniquity.[1]

Jesus' opponents, unable to deny His undoubted successes, but all the more anxious to discredit Him with the populace, went so far as to accuse Him of casting out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. To this charge Jesus replied: "How can Satan cast out Satan? A kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and a house divided against itself cannot stand. And if Satan rise up against himself and is divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end. No one can enter into the house of the strong man, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man, and then he will spoil his house. . . . Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness. . . . And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth."[2]

[1] Mark vii, 1–23; Matt. xv, 1–20. Cf. Loisy on these texts, to distinguish which are the later additions; Nicolardot, pp. 264–7; Goguel, Marc, pp. 150–4.

[2] The passage given above combines three pericopes, all originating in a common source, but each incomplete, and showing slight changes: Matt. xii, 22–32; Luke xi, 14–23; Mark iii, 22–9. Cf. Loisy on these texts; Nicolardot, pp. 233–41; Goguel, Marc, pp. 85–99.

His enemies also demanded of Jesus a special sign from heaven to show His Divine mission. Thereupon He declared: "This evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given it but the sign of Jonah the prophet. For even as Jonah was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here." [1]

* * * * *

Side by side with these sad experiences, however, Jesus had others of a different kind. Whilst He was still living in Capernaum, a centurion, doubtless of heathen stock, and probably a Jewish proselyte, came to beg Him to heal his son or his servant, and shewed so much faith that Jesus marvelled, saying that He had not found a faith so great in Israel.[2] Later when, discouraged by the hostile attitude of His race towards Him and His Gospel, He took refuge in the borders of Phenicia, seeking peaceful seclusion there, He had an even more striking and encouraging experience. A woman of the Canaanites asked Him to heal her daughter, displaying so much discrimination and perseverance that it aroused His astonish-

[1] Matt. xii, 39, 41–2; Luke xi, 16, 29–32. Cf. Loisy on these passages.

[2] Luke vii, 1–10; Matt. viii, 5–10, 13.

ment, and He gave her the succour she desired, although at first, under the influence of the Jewish exclusiveness which still to some extent dominated Him, He had refused it.[1] He may have had similar experiences among the Samaritans.[2]

Considering the indifference or the stubbornness of the Jewish populace and the hostility of their leaders on the one hand, and, on the other, the manifestation of certain very fine and impressive qualities in many heathens, or others of non-Jewish faith, Jesus gradually became convinced that the former would be rejected and the latter enter the Kingdom of God before them.[3] He does not seem to have laid much stress upon this point, however, for His immediate disciples did not think of undertaking a mission to the heathen after His death.[4] He had moreover given them no precedent for such a mission, being undoubtedly persuaded, like the prophets of old, that the Kingdom of God once established in Israel would spontaneously attract all the rest of the world.[5] None the less, by His making salvation depend solely upon religious and moral principles, even the simple human virtues, and not upon narrow dogma and exclusive ritual, and still less upon a question of race, He laid the foundation of Christian universalism.

The ill-will of the Jewish people and their leaders

[1] Mark vii, 24–6, 27–30, and Matt. xv, 26, which is more primitive than Mark vii, 27. Cf. Loisy here, and Nicolardot, p. 268 ; Goguel, Marc, p. 154 et seq.

[2] Luke xvii, 11–19. Cf. x, 30–7.

[3] Matt. xiii, 11–12 ; xi, 20–4 ; xii, 39, 41–2 ; xix, 30 ; xx, 16 ; xxii, 1–10 ; Luke x, 12–15 ; xi, 29–32 ; xiii, 6–9, 28–30 ; xiv, 16–24.

[4] Piepenbring, Jésus et les Apôtres, pp. 8–9.

[5] Is. ii, 2–4 ; Micah iv, 1–3.

towards Jesus made yet another impression upon Him. Besides the thought of their being debarred from salvation and replaced by others in the Kingdom of God, He was also haunted by the idea that persecution and even death might await Him and His disciples. He remembered the blood shed by the enemies of the prophets of old.[1] Above all the example of John the Baptist, recently put to death by Herod, shewed Him the fate to which He was Himself exposed.[2] It even appears that the tetrarch was seeking Jesus' death also.[3] From that time forth He predicted that His disciples would be abused and persecuted, as the prophets before them.[4] Then, too, He must have exhorted them to bear patiently the persecution to which they would be subjected, not to render evil for evil, but to love their enemies and to pray for their tormentors, so that they might prove themselves the children of the Heavenly Father who maketh His sun to rise on the just and on the unjust.[5]

Other exhortations of the same nature must have been addressed at this time by Jesus to His disciples, to encourage them to persevere in their mission, in spite of the difficulties and dangers threatening them. In this connection we may recall the following words: "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves. . . . A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. . . . There is nothing covered that shall not be

[1] Matt. xxiii, 34–7; Luke xi, 49–51; xiii, 33–4.
[2] Mark vi, 14–16; ix, 13.
[3] Luke xiii, 31–2.
[4] Matt. v, 11–12; Luke vi, 22–3.
[5] Matt. v, 39–42, 44–8; Luke vi, 27–30, 32–3, 35–6.

revealed, and hid that shall not be known. What I tell you in the darkness, speak ye in the light; and what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops. And be not afraid of them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall upon the ground without your Father; but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows. Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before the angels of God; but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God. . . . Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. . . . He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." [1]

2. The Feeding of the Multitudes and the Scene at Cæsarea Philippi.

It is at the time which marks off the second period of Jesus' ministry from the first, that we must place

[1] Matt. x, 16, 24–39 R.V.; Luke vi, 40; x, 3; xii, 2–9, 51–3; xiv, 26–7; xvii, 33.

the episode of the multiplying of the loaves. Tradition has made two occurrences out of this episode, and they are related in parallel passages, although they evidently refer to one and the same fact.[1] A modern critic writes: "The stories of the loaves occupy a very significant place in Mark's Gospel. They come at the end of the first part of the Gospel and terminate his account of the efforts made by Jesus to influence the populace. In the second part of the recital Jesus is seen to be concerned with His disciples only."[2]

The two accounts, as actually related, endeavour to record a miracle. In this respect tradition, influenced by certain stories in the Old Testament relating to the way in which God had miraculously fed the people of Israel and some of the prophets,[3] seems also to have embellished the original fact. But if some have often been inclined to regard the stories in question as purely legendary, and inspired by the others of a like nature just mentioned, they will certainly be going too far. On the contrary, these seem to be founded upon an incontestable and very interesting fact, which we must try to grasp in order to throw light upon one highly important feature of the ministry of Jesus.

It seems as if in its original form this episode of feeding the multitudes dealt with a perfectly natural distribution of bread. Its most outstanding feature, in fact, appears to be that the breaking of the bread

[1] Mark vi, 34–44; viii, 1–9. Cf. Holtzmann, J. Weiss and Loisy on these passages; Goguel, Marc, pp. 141–7, 158–60; ibid., Eucharistie, pp. 52–3.

[2] Goguel, Eucharistie, p. 53. Cf. pp. 189–90.

[3] Ex. xvi, 8, 13; Num. xi, 21–2; 1 Kings xvii, 8–16; 2 Kings iv, 38–41; Ps. cvii, 4–9.

was accompanied by an act of benediction. We may therefore conclude that it is matter of history that Jesus upon one occasion took some loaves which He had at His disposal, pronounced a blessing upon them and broke them, and then distributed them by the hands of His disciples. The details concerning the number of persons present, and the fact that there was more than enough for all, have no doubt been added later in order to give the story its miraculous character. For this purpose, too, it must have been stated that the scene occurred in a desert place whither the crowds had followed Jesus, and in which they could obtain no food.[1]

To understand aright the import of Jesus' action in inviting the crowd to eat bread with Him and His disciples, we must recollect the position which the emblem of a repast occupies in the Gospel story. One of Jesus' hearers once said to Him without suffering reproof: "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God."[2] At the last meal taken by Jesus with His disciples He Himself said: "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until the day that I drink it new in the Kingdom of God."[3] He added: "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."[4] On another occasion He said: "Many shall come from the east and the west and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God."[5] It is quite natural, therefore, that in many of His parables He should have compared the Kingdom of God with

[1] Goguel, Eucharistie, pp. 52–3. Cf. Carpenter, pp. 186–9.
[2] Luke xiv, 15.
[3] Mark xiv, 25.
[4] Luke xxii, 29–30.
[5] Matt. viii, 11; Luke xiii, 29.

a banquet,[1] and we must conclude that Jesus clearly had the idea of a Messianic banquet in His mind. Consequently we are warranted in believing that His distribution of bread to the people around Him was the forecast of the Messianic banquet. And this point of view of His is all the more comprehensible since the Old Testament, as well as later Jewish literature, assumes God to be preparing, upon Mount Zion, " a feast of fat things unto all people ", or in some other way satisfying His faithful followers.[2]

* * * * *

The most important fact to note in this new phase of Jesus' ministry is that He raised the question of His Messiahship, whilst up till then, and undoubtedly during the greater part of His public life, He had never spoken of it, but confined Himself to predicting the speedy approach of the Kingdom of God, to making known the conditions to be fulfilled by those who would enter therein, and to setting forth His views on the providential care and compassionate love of God. Mark's Gospel indeed tells us that on His return from the journey He had undertaken in the northern regions beyond Galilee, He arrived in the district of Cæsarea Philippi. And there, while walking along, He suddenly asked His disciples: " ' Whom do men say that I am ? ' They answered ' John the Baptist ' ; but some say ' Elias ' and others ' One of the prophets.' And He asked them again: ' But whom say ye that I am ? ' Peter answering

[1] Matt. xxii, 1 et seq. ; xxv, 1 et seq. ; Luke xiv, 16 et seq.

[2] Is. xxv, 6 ; lv, 1–2 ; lxv, 13 ; Ezek. xxxiv, 13–19 ; Ps. xxiii ; cxxxii, 15 ; Prov. ix, 5 ; Eccles. xv, 3 ; xxiv, 17–21 ; Wisd. xvi, 20 ; Enoch xxiv, 4 ; lxii, 4 ; Rev. ii, 7 ; vii, 16–17 ; xix, 9. Cf. Goguel, Eucharistie, pp. 54–7.

saith unto Him: 'Thou art the Christ.' And He charged them that they should tell no man of Him." [1]

This remarkable account is assuredly original and quite authentic, for it is entirely at variance with the later point of view dominating the Gospels, since these all assume that the Messiahship of Jesus was known from the very beginning of His ministry, or even from His birth, whilst this very story shews that until towards the close of His ministry Jesus had never spoken of it, and when His disciples divined Him to be the Messiah, He expressly forbade their speaking of it in public. The compilers of our Gospels, then, have only preserved the isolated account just related, out of respect for the source whence it was derived. And thus we are in a position to correct the error we have noted, according to which the Messiahship of Jesus must have been known for a very long time.

But are we right in concluding from this and other passages in the Gospel that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, or must we, as certain modern critics do, decide upon a different solution, and admit that all the statements contained in the Gospels in which Jesus assumes or affirms His Messiahship have been put into His mouth by the Early Church? [2] And if we answer this question in the affirmative, in what sense did Jesus ascribe to Himself this title of Messiah, which has always been so differently conceived in the fold of Judaism? [3] It is quite certain

[1] Mark viii, 27–30.

[2] Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, p. 622; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 308–9.

[3] Piepenbring, Christologie, chap. ii.

that in this respect more than in any other our Gospels have already been profoundly influenced by Apostolic theology. The greatest possible care must be exercised in examining this problem, which is one of cardinal importance to evangelical history and Christian doctrine.

3. Jesus' Messiahship.

Although there are modern theologians who doubt or even deny that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah,[1] others again differ concerning the sense in which He attributed the Messianic office to Himself, and the time at which He became assured of it.[2] It is undoubtedly a fact that at first He ranked Himself simply as a prophet, and this He did until towards the end of His ministry. Confronted with the unbelief of the people of Nazareth, He declared: "A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house."[3] When certain of the Pharisees warned Him that Herod was threatening to kill Him, He replied: "I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following, for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."[4] In sight of that unbelieving and stubborn city, He exclaimed: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together."[5] By the

[1] Holtzmann, Bewusstsein, pp. 4–13. [2] Ibid., pp. 13–20.
[3] Mark vi, 4. [4] Luke xiii, 31–3.
[5] Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34; cf. xi, 49–51. If the first parallel verse is a mere quotation from one of the books of Wisdom, as is now supposed to be the case, the conclusion drawn from it is not thereby invalidated.

public, too, Jesus was regarded as a prophet,[1] and it was the same in the primitive Church.[2]

This prophetic character, explicitly claimed by Jesus, suffices to explain many points in the Gospels, where He ascribes superior authority to Himself, without its being necessary to appeal to any other dignity for this, for we must not forget the immense authority, in speech and action, with which the old prophets of Israel were invested. Unhesitatingly and without presumption they exalted themselves above all other earthly powers, because they were convinced of holding the authority and power of their ministry direct from God. They considered themselves Divine agents or deputies, His "mouthpiece." To withstand them was, in their eyes, to oppose God and His holy cause.[3] John the Baptist had once again exercised this authority with respect to the Jewish nation, to whom he told some very hard truths in predicting God's righteous judgment, and, too, with respect to Herod Antipas, whom he reproved for adultery.[4] Even in the character of a mere prophet, then, Jesus could, and did, imitate His predecessors.

Starting from this point we can readily understand many features of the Gospel story, such as the following. Jesus likens Himself to a physician, because He calls sinners to repentance.[5] He does not fast, nor make His disciples fast, placing His authority in this, above an ancient Jewish custom, respected even

[1] Mark vi, 14–16; viii, 27–8; Matt. xxi, 11, 46; Luke vii, 16; xxiv, 19; cf. vii, 39.

[2] Acts iii, 22; vii, 37; cf. ii, 22.

[3] Piepenbring, Théologie, p. 75 et seq.; ibid., Histoire, p. 229 et seq.

[4] Vide infra, chap. i, § 2; Mark vi, 14–29.

[5] Mark ii, 17.

by John the Baptist.[1] He does not observe nor enforce the strict observance of the Sabbath,[2] nor the regulations of the Levitical cleansings, because He held purity of heart to be alone of true value.[3] He thwarts the too exclusively external worship of the Temple.[4] He exalts Himself above not only the greatest of His own race,[5] but also above all the members of the Kingdom of God,[6] and from this standpoint, He declares that accepting or rejecting Him is the same as accepting or rejecting God.[7] He maintains that the duty of following Him comes before every other, even the most sacred obligations.[8] He is persuaded that heaven and earth will pass away sooner than His words.[9] Capernaum, peculiarly privileged by reason of Jesus' sojourn in it and the ministry He carried on there, is to be punished with excessive severity because it did not profit by this unusual advantage.[10] The same fate will overtake the Jews in general, since they have acted in a similar manner.[11]

Yet other points in the Gospel story cannot be satisfactorily explained unless we admit that Jesus was aware of His Messiahship.[12] He says indeed that He is to be loved more than the very nearest relatives.[13] When John the Baptist, by his messengers, inquires

[1] Mark ii, 18–19.
[2] Mark ii, 23–iii, 5.
[3] Mark vii, 5–15.
[4] Mark xi, 15–17.
[5] Matt. xii, 41–2; Luke xi, 31–2.
[6] Matt. xi, 11; Luke vii, 28.
[7] Matt. x, 24–5, 40; Luke vi, 40; x, 16.
[8] Matt. viii, 19–32; Luke ix, 57–62.
[9] Mark xiii, 31. Cf. Matt. v, 18; Luke xvi, 17.
[10] Matt. xi, 23; Luke x, 15.
[11] Matt. xii, 41–2; Luke xi, 31–2.
[12] Holtzmann, Bewusstsein, pp. 20–49; ibid., Theologie, i, pp. 297–309; Loisy, L'Evangile et l'Eglise, pp. 82–4; ibid., Synoptiques, i, pp. 240–1; Weinel, op. cit., 32, 35.
[13] Matt. x, 37; Luke xiv, 26.

whether He is the Messiah, He does not return a negative answer, but refers to His truly Messianic works and declares him blessed who shall not be offended in Him.[1] So, too, when Peter proclaims Him the Messiah, He does not repudiate the statement.[2] And still more decisive and significant is the fact that towards the end of His ministry when, confronted by the hostility of His enemies, He is foretelling His death, He declares that He is about to leave the world, but only to return in the name of the Lord.[3] Elsewhere He predicts in explicit terms His approaching triumphant return, when He will rule His servants as their true Master.[4] At the Last Judgment, which will then take place, He will testify to the faithfulness of some and the unfaithfulness of others.[5] It is natural, therefore, that His disciples should have regarded Him as the future Messiah and have asked of Him the chief places in the Kingdom of God.[6] Finally, the most certain proof that Jesus acted as if He were the Messiah, at least towards the close of His ministry, is that He was accused and condemned for that reason, for the inscription on His cross, setting forth the cause of His condemnation was : " The King of the Jews."[7]

Here are some other considerations, too, which corroborate this view. The disciples of Jesus would never have believed in His Messiahship after His

[1] Matt. xi, 2–6 ; Luke vii, 19–23.
[2] Mark viii, 27–30.
[3] Matt. xxiii, 39 ; Luke xiii, 35.
[4] Matt. xxiv, 27, 37–51 ; Luke xii, 35–48 ; xvii, 23–4, 34–5.
[5] Matt. x, 32–3 ; Luke xii, 8–9 ; Mark viii, 38. Cf. Matt. vii, 22–3 ; Luke xiii, 25–7.
[6] Mark x, 35–7, 42–4 ; Luke xxii, 24–7.
[7] Mark xv, 26. Cf. Holtzmann, Bewusstsein, pp. 36–7.

death (which must have appeared to contradict it), if they did not already do so.[1] And they assuredly could not have been convinced of it during His lifetime if He had not had the conviction and awakened it in them, for Jesus' earthly life did not in any way correspond with the Jewish expectations concerning their Messiah. Again, had this belief of theirs been contrary to His own conviction, Jesus would have protested against it, yet nowhere in the Gospels do we find the least trace of such a protest. And yet again : if Jesus Himself had not believed in His Messiahship He would have spoken, as John the Baptist did, of a greater than He who should come after Him, and this He never did. On the contrary, His conduct throughout led them to assume that no greater messenger of God than He was to be expected. He knew no superior save God alone, and He therefore must have considered Himself the Messiah.

* * * * *

How did Jesus conceive of His Messiahship ? The Jewish ideas of the Messianic personality varying widely, have considerably influenced Christianity and produced also within its fold very different Christologies.[2] Since we already find in our Gospels a reflection of this, it will be advisable to state here a number of very elementary yet very important points. These will allow of our being guided by facts rather than theories, for upon this question the latter have always had free course, and only too often resulted in consequences which are most fantastic, and directly opposed to historical accuracy.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that Jesus followed

[1] Holtzmann, ibid., pp. 37–8. [2] Piepenbring, Christologie.

the trade of carpenter till He was about thirty, and that He led so simple a life that His nearest relatives, including His mother, had not the slightest inkling of His special Messianic mission, but sought to impede His ministry, which they regarded as a sign of mental aberration.[1] The people of Nazareth, where he had lived until then, were as far from thinking that He could have a special mission or be by nature superior in any way, as His relatives were.[2] His lowly position and modest nature were shewn also in what followed. He went as a learner to John the Baptist and was baptized by him without in any way differentiating Himself from the crowds who resorted to him feeling the burden of their sins and desiring to atone for them that they might have the right to enter the Kingdom of God. He did not Himself begin to preach until after the imprisonment of His master, who was thus rendered incapable of continuing his work.[3] At first, then, He was John's subordinate, and in the early part of His own ministry upon an equal footing with the latter's disciples. He made Himself the equal of all men, calling all who did the will of God His brethren.[4] When the disciples besought the chief places in the Kingdom of God, He earnestly rebuked their vainglorious schemes, and exhorted them to have no ambition save to minister to others as He himself strove to do.[5] Moreover, He sought out and frequented the society of ordinary people by preference ; He even caressed and blessed little children.[6]

His attitude towards God, too, was always very

[1] Mark iii, 21 ; 31–5.
[2] Mark vi, 1–6.
[3] Mark i, 14.
[4] Mark iii, 35.
[5] Mark x, 42–4 and parallel passages ; Matt. xxiii, 11.
[6] Mark x, 13–16

humble and lowly. He often prayed.[1] He relied on Divine assistance in performing His miracles.[2] When upon one occasion He was called "Good Master", He replied that there was none good save God alone.[3] He set the Holy Spirit above His own personality.[4] He confessed that there were limits to His knowledge and His power.[5] From these numerous instances we see that Jesus, while believing Himself to be the Messiah, invariably conducted Himself like an ordinary man, and never claimed a superhuman nature for Himself. The Early Church sought to minimize or even obliterate these characteristics, but there are numerous proofs of them in the Gospels.[6]

Although the idea contradicts the belief formerly held, we must recognize besides that Jesus never believed Himself to be the actual Messiah in His lifetime, but regarded Himself as the Messiah of the future. This explains why He never explicitly took the title of Messiah during His ministry, either with respect to John the Baptist or to His own disciples when they recognized His Messiahship; He even forbade the latter to speak of the matter publicly.[7] For like all His race, He was persuaded that the Messiah was a glorious being, encompassed about with heavenly splendour.[8] It has often been thought that Jesus kept His Messiahship secret for so long because He conceived of it differently from the

[1] Mark i, 35; vi, 46; xiv, 35–6; Matt. xi, 25–6; xiv, 23; Luke iii, 21; v, 16; vi, 12; ix, 18, 28–9; x, 21; xi, 1.

[2] Mark v, 19; vi, 41; vii, 34; Matt. xii, 28; Luke xi, 20; xvii, 18.

[3] Mark x, 17–18.

[4] Matt. xii, 32; Luke xii, 10.

[5] Mark x, 40; xiii, 32.

[6] Cf. Wernle, Jesus, pp. 314–16.

[7] Matt. xi, 2–6; Luke vii, 18–23; Mark viii, 27–30.

[8] Matt. xxiv, 27; Luke xvii, 24; Mark viii, 38; xiii, 26; xiv, 62.

populace, and desired first to inculcate a loftier conception of it in their minds; we have been told, too, that if He had avowed it in the very beginning of His ministry, it would have provoked a political revolution which would have compromised Him and His work. In reality, Jesus could not consider Himself the actual Messiah in the humble circumstances then His. Had the Messiah been merely a teacher, as many Christians have held, and still do think, there would have been no incompatibility in such an idea. Jesus, however, did not hold this view. In His eyes, the Messiah was, or would be, a truly glorious personage, as we have just said, and as we shall find confirmed later. During Jesus' earthly life, then, He could at most regard Himself as the virtual Messiah, not the actual and present one. He expected the full and complete manifestation of the Messiah, as of the Kingdom of God, in the future, and in a very near future.[1] And in the Early Church, this point of view was at first adopted; Jesus was regarded as the Christ or the Messiah only by virtue of His resurrection and His glorification on high.[2]

4. The Messianic Titles

It is clearly because Jesus considered Himself the Messiah of the future, the expectant Messiah only, that the title "Son of Man" has been bestowed upon Him. Unfortunately there is a difference of opinion about the true meaning of the term. Some consider

[1] J. Weiss, pp. 158–9, 165 et seq.; Schweitzer, Abendmahl, ii, p. 63 et seq.; Loisy, L'Evangile et l'Eglise, pp. 84–7; ibid., Synoptiques, i, pp. 213, 242.

[2] Acts ii, 32–6; Rom. i, 4.

it only an affirmation of His perfect humanity, or the designation of the ideal man; others support its Messianic character, whilst interpreting this in widely differing senses; and yet others advance intermediate views of varied shades of thought.[1] This great diversity of opinion shows us that we are dealing with a very difficult problem. In this, as in many other questions of the same nature, the difficulties have been increased and complicated because only too often the distinction has not been drawn, or not sufficiently drawn, between the original and historical elements of our Gospels and the later elements influenced by the various currents of Apostolic theology. Directly we allow ourselves to be guided mainly by the former, these difficulties in part disappear.

The title "Son of Man" occurs very frequently in our Gospels, sixty-nine times in the Synoptics, and twelve times in John's Gospel. It is met with, too, in the *Logia*; therefore it goes a long way back. It is only to be found in Jesus' mouth, whence it has been concluded that it necessarily proceeded from Him, but this is a matter for serious doubt.[2] Bousset has adopted this negative argument and in a detailed study has made it appear very probable, whilst yet admitting that in certain rare cases Jesus may have claimed the title for a future date.[3] In the oldest

[1] Keim, ii, pp. 65–76; Baldensperger, Die messianisch-apokaliptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums, pp. 127–42; Krop, pp. 118–132; Holtzmann, Theologie, pp. 313–35; ibid., Bewusstsein, pp. 49–75, 83–98; J. Weiss, pp. 157–75, 201–10; Bousset, pp. 301–8; Chapuis, Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 1904, pp. 5–7; Monnier, pp. 66–99; Feine, pp. 40–69; Weinel, p. 189 et seq.

[2] Holtzmann, Bewusstsein, pp. 51–3; ibid., Theologie, i, pp. 314–15; Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, p. 670 et seq.

[3] Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 5–12, 20–3. Cf. ibid., Religion, pp. 307–8, footnotes; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 313 et seq.; Weinel, § 34.

tradition of the Gospels, the title has indeed a fundamentally eschatological character,[1] like the concept of the Kingdom of God.[2] It is from the book of Daniel that Jesus must have mainly derived the idea that the Kingdom of God would not be founded by any human agency, but would come from heaven to earth in a miraculous way.[3] It is therefore natural that He should have been guided by this book, too, with respect to the conception of the Messiah or the Son of Man.[4] He afterwards took this title towards the end of His ministry, though using it but rarely.[5] We must add that Daniel's concept of it is possibly of more remote origin, and of Iranian source.[6]

In any case, it is in the most ancient Gospel texts that we must look for the primitive Christian meaning of this Messianic title, and more particularly in passages in which Jesus is not describing Himself as the present Messiah. He appears to have preferred to stop short at the idea of the Son of Man, the notion that He might be the actual Messiah not having occurred to Him, seeing the humble position in life that was His. He could not therefore have spoken of the coming of the Son of Man save in an impersonal

[1] Luke xii, 40; xvii, 22, 24, 26, 30; xviii, 8; xxi, 36; xxii, 69; Matt. x, 23; xix, 28; xxiv, 27, 37, 39, 44; Mark viii, 38; xiii, 26; xiv, 62.

[2] J. Weiss, Predigt, passim; Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, p. 615 et seq.

[3] Dan. ii, 34–5, 44–5; vii, 27. Cf. Matt. vi, 10; Luke xi, 2; xxii, 24–6; Mark x, 42–4.

[4] Dan. vii, 13–4. Cf. J. Weiss, Predigt, p. 162 et seq.; ibid., Christus, pp. 30–2; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 329–40, 384–5; ibid., Bewusstsein, p. 69 et seq.; Monnier, p. 67 et seq.; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 243.

[5] Loisy, ibid., i, 243; Weinel, p. 191 et seq.

[6] Bousset, Religion, pp. 404–7; Monnier, p. 90 et seq.; Clemen, op. cit., pp. 116–23.

sense,[1] His disciples having applied these predictions to Him afterwards only. However this may be, since He cannot have adopted this application until towards the end of His ministry (for the scene at Cæsarea Philippi proves that until then the question of His Messiahship had never been brought up), all the passages in which He is represented as speaking of His Messiahship beforehand, or as making any distinct allusion to it, are not historical or else are not in their true chronological order.

In the book of Daniel, the Son of Man is represented as sitting with the Ancient of Days and proceeding to judge the world.[2] The book of Enoch, too, shews Him set above the angels upon a throne of glory, and about to preside over the judgment of mankind.[3] It is from these sources of Jewish thought and not from Jesus' authentic teaching, that many features in our Gospels have been borrowed. They are features worthy of being noted here, seeing the importance of the question at stake, one which has always taken a leading place within the fold of Christianity.

As Son of Man, and Christ, Jesus is supposed to be seated on the right hand of God and sharing in His power.[4] Then He is reputed to be coming in the clouds in the glory of His Father, and surrounded by angels,[5] whom He will send to gather together the elect from the four quarters of the earth.[6] Thus the idea came

[1] Matt. xxiv, 37, 39; Luke xvii, 26, 30.
[2] Dan. vii, 9–14; cf. ii, 37–45.
[3] Piepenbring, Christologie, pp. 25 et seq.
[4] Mark xiv, 62; Luke xxii, 69; John iii, 14; viii, 28; xii, 34; Acts ii, 33–6; v, 31; vii, 56, 59–60.
[5] Mark viii, 38; xiii, 26; xiv, 62; 1 Thess. iv, 15–16.
[6] Mark xiii, 27. Cf. Matt. xiii, 41.

about that the Kingdom or rule of Christ would replace that of God ;[1] for upon the Son of Man of the book of Daniel was to be conferred dominion and glory and a kingdom of all the nations of the earth.[2] In this way people began to speak of the day of the Son of Man, as in the Old Testament of the day of the Lord (Jahweh).[3] And just as the eschatology of the Jews predicts the coming of the Lord God,[4] so does that of the Christians announce the reappearance of Jesus Christ.[5]

In this connection it is significant that the latter, as Son of Man, becomes the future judge of the world also, and is even to replace God in this respect. Such an evolution, however, only takes place gradually. At first Christ Jesus is simply a witness before God at the Day of Judgment,[6] and from this point of view, God's sovereignty is still fully maintained.[7] Afterwards the Son of Man, coming in the glory of the Father, Himself settles accounts with those who have denied Him.[8] Later still, He becomes the judge who rewards every man according to his works.[9] Finally He is the king seated upon His throne of glory, with all the nations gathered together before Him, that He may separate the good

[1] Matt. xiii, 41 ; xvi, 28 ; xx, 21 ; Luke xxii, 29–30 ; xxiii, 42.
[2] Dan. vii, 14.
[3] Luke xvii, 26, 30 ; 1 Cor. i, 8. Cf. Luke xvii, 22 ; Acts ii, 20 ; Gressmann, Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie, § 15.
[4] Ibid., § 3 et seq.
[5] Matt. xxiv, 37, 39, 44 ; 1 Thess. ii, 19 ; iii, 13 ; iv, 15 ; v, 23.
[6] Matt. x, 32–3 ; Luke xii, 8–9.
[7] Matt. x, 28 ; Luke xii, 5. Cf. Mark x, 40 ; Luke xii, 32.
[8] Mark viii, 38.
[9] Matt. xvi, 27. Cf. Luke xxi, 36. We see thus how the words of Jesus were altered by degrees to enhance the glory of the Christ.

from the bad, and pronounce the final sentence on both.[1] This progressive glorification of the Christ is but the effect of the Christological movement as it grew more pronounced in the Early Church.[2]

We have seen what a powerful influence Judaism exercised in forming the Christology of the Early Christians. It is natural that this should be so, too, in the case of the Messianic title of "Son of David." Thus according to the First Gospel, which was particularly for the Jewish Christians, this appellation is said to have been bestowed upon Jesus on certain occasions, without His finding anything amiss in it,[3] whilst Mark and Luke record but one of these instances only.[4] He is also assumed to declare Himself greater than David,[5] as well as being greater than Solomon and Jonas.[6] The Apostolic theology evidently influenced the Evangelists in giving Jesus the title of Son of David,[7] and to this, too, we owe the corresponding genealogies,[8] the many discrepancies in which betray their artificial character.[9]

The Gospels not only acclaimed Jesus as Son of Man and Son of David, but frequently also as the Christ and the Son of God,[10] and this clearly tallies

[1] Matt, xxv, 31–46. Cf. Acts x, 42; 2 Cor. v, 10.
[2] See Piepenbring, Christologie, chaps. iii–vii.
[3] Matt. ix, 27; xii, 23; xv, 22; xx, 30–1; xxi, 15.
[4] Mark x, 47–8; Luke xviii, 38–9.
[5] Mark xii, 35–7.
[6] Matt. xii, 41–2; Luke xi, 31–2.
[7] Rom. i, 3; xv, 12; 2 Tim. ii, 8; Heb. vii, 14; Acts xiii, 23; Matt. i, 1; Luke i, 32.
[8] Matt. i, 1–17; Luke iii, 23–38.
[9] Holtzmann, Bewusstsein, pp. 24–29; ibid., Theologie, pp. 309–13. Cf. Weinel, p. 200 et seq.; Piepenbring, Christologie, p. 37.
[10] Mark i, 11, 24; iii, 11; v, 7; viii, 29; ix, 7, 41; xii, 6; xiii, 32; xiv, 61–2; xv, 32, 39; Matt. iv, 3, 6; xi, 27; xiv, 33; Luke iv, 3, 9; x, 22.

with the views which preponderated in the infancy of the Church. It started with the idea that Jesus of Nazareth, a man whose mission God had recognized in accomplishing great miracles through His agency, had become both the Christ and the Son of God through His being raised to God's right hand.[1] This adoptionist and theocratic point of view was founded upon principles current in Israel and throughout the East in classical antiquity, where reigning sovereigns were regarded as Divine by nature.[2] Nevertheless it is possible that the title of Son of God was bestowed upon Jesus Christ under the influence of Hellenism only, for this made itself early, and increasingly, felt in the Primitive Church ;[3] certainly the metaphysical connotation of the title originates there.[4] The purely theocratic and honorary title of Son of God did not exclude the perfectly *human* nature of him who held it, as we see from the example of the Kings of Israel who bore it,[5] or of many other sovereigns in the same case. Many a trait proves that the Early Christians, holding this point of view, thought that Jesus' might and power came to Him from God, and were not an integral part of His nature.[6]

The title of Son of God applied to Jesus, com-

[1] Acts ii, 22–36 ; xiii, 33–4 ; Luke xxii, 66–70. Cf. Ps. ii, 7 ; J. Weiss, Christus, pp. 21–2 ; ibid., Das Urchristentum, pp. 85–8.

[2] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 335–40 ; J. Weiss, op, cit., pp. 19–21 ; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 226 ; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, p. 110 et seq. ; Jeremias, Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur, pp. 50, 171 et seq., 190 ; Kittel on Ps. ii, 7–9.

[3] Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 65–70 ; Piepenbring, Christologie, chap. iv.

[4] Piepenbring, ibid., chaps. v and vi.

[5] 2 Sam. vii, 14 ; Ps. ii, 7 ; lxxxix, 27–8.

[6] Mark ii, 12 ; v, 19 ; vii, 34 ; Matt. ix, 8 ; xii, 28 ; John iii, 2 ; x, 31 ; Acts ii, 22 ; x, 38.

prehensible from the theocratic standpoint, should therefore not be urged as militating against the concept of Jesus' human nature, as it so long has been. If this concept has almost disappeared from our Gospels, it is because Mark, the main source of the others, was already very much dominated by the dogmatism of the Early Church.[1] Nevertheless it does emerge in certain phases which must be noted here, and which prove that spiritually Jesus did not differentiate Himself from other men. Thus, according to Him, all godly and devout people are the children of God,[2] and as sons and daughters of God, they are His brethren and His sisters.[3] Since Jesus frequently felt the need of prayer, we see how much He felt Himself to be dependent on God. He seemed to put Himself on a footing of equality with all humanity in refusing the title of Good Master, and declaring that God alone was good.[4] We must therefore conclude that He did not set Himself above ordinary mortals save by virtue of the very special duties He had undertaken.[5]

An argument frequently brought forward to combat this conclusion is founded upon a passage which forms part of the *Logia*, upon the authority of which Jesus must one day have declared that all things had been delivered Him by His Father, and that none knew the Son but the Father, nor the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son would reveal Him.[6]

[1] See particularly J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium; Loisy, L'Evangile selon Marc.

[2] Matt. v, 9, 45; vi, 8–9; Luke vi, 35; xi, 2.

[3] Mark iii, 35.

[4] Mark x, 17–18.

[5] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 340–4. Cf. Beyschlag, Neutestamentliche Theologie, i, pp. 67–73; Weinel, § 33.

[6] Matt. xi, 27; Luke x, 22.

But there we have an attempt at Christological speculative thought, leading up to the theory propounded in the Fourth Gospel, or else a profession of faith in Christ, rather than an authentic saying of Jesus.[1] It even appears as if the whole passage in Matthew's Gospel of which this declaration forms part [2] is a kind of Psalm in imitation of ecclesiastical ones, its genesis being due to a Christian singer or prophet, and not to Jesus at all.[3] We need feel no astonishment that the Messianic title in question should have been put into Jesus' mouth under a misapprehension, since that of Son of Man, which He Himself hardly ever used, has so often been attributed to Him in a fashion both arbitrary and ill-founded, as we have just seen.

* * * * *

When and how did Jesus come to the conclusion that He was the Messiah? It is difficult to say, for He made no parade of His inner life, hidden with God, like that of all deeply religious souls. According to traditional opinion, He must have been aware of His Messiahship even in His early youth. In modern times it has often been advanced that this consciousness was awakened in Him only at His baptism, when the Spirit of God descended upon Him and a voice from Heaven declared Him to be the beloved Son of God. Other thinkers, not admitting the historical

[1] Loisy, Quatrième Evangile, p. 103; ibid., Synoptiques, i, pp. 194, 908–11.

[2] Matt. xi, 25–30.

[3] Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 667–70; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 127, 256, 908–15; Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 345–52; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 58–63. Cf. Norden, Agnostos Theos., pp. 277–308.

accuracy of this last feature of the baptism, have maintained that Jesus arrived at the conviction of His being the Messiah only during the course of His ministry, probably near the time when He first raised the question at Cæsarea Philippi.[1] One argument in favour of this last theory is that all the texts in which Jesus affirms His Messiahship, which are to be found in the original Gospels, belong to the last period of His ministry. And we have also seen clearly how serious were the motives which might have induced Jesus to undertake His ministry quite independently of His Messiahship.

At any rate, from a certain period of His public work, Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, and made statements in such a sense with ever-increasing definiteness. Therefore nothing can be more erroneous than the view occasionally advanced that it was in spite of Himself and only in conformity with the wish of the people and of His disciples that He posed as the Messiah, or that elation engendered by His success made Him believe that He possessed this attribute.[2] On the contrary, one of the most undeniable facts of the Gospel story is that Jesus did not openly assert His Messiahship until the time when the failure attendant upon His preparatory work had become evident and He would have been obliged to disavow the consciousness of Messiahship, had it reached Him from without. In reality He maintained it in face of and against the whole world, even when it was to founder through His death, a catastrophe

[1] Holtzmann, Bewusstsein, pp. 45–9, 86 et seq. Cf. ibid., Theologie, i, pp. 338–40.

[2] Colani, Jésus et les croyances messianiques, 2nd ed., pp. 123 et seq., p. 169 et seq.; Schenkel, Das Charakterbild Jesus, 2nd ed., p. 136 et seq.; Renan, Vie de Jésus, chap. xv.

which He had not at first expected. This conviction of His, then, was the fruit of a profound inner belief, independent of all outward circumstances; it was borne in upon His soul like a revelation from on high, as the expression of the Will of God.

How did He arrive at it? For Him it would be enough to be clearly convinced of His real superiority, and we have already ascertained that this was so, for we have seen that Jesus was fully aware that He surpassed the greatest men of the Old Covenant.[1] He could not fail, then, to arrive at the conviction that He was destined for a loftier part, and His Jewish standpoint would at that time convince Him that He was, or would be, the Messiah. This was borne in upon Him both by His personal worthiness, and by the circumstances of His day and His surroundings, for the expectation of the approaching end of the world and the imminent advent of the Kingdom of God was one He shared with all His devout co-religionists. John the Baptist had inculcated it in his race with such insistent energy that he made a profound impression on multitudes of people and also upon Jesus. Henceforward they had to ask themselves who the Messiah might be. They thought it might be some great man like John the Baptist.[2] How was it possible, then, that Jesus should not have thought of Himself, from the moment He became conscious, as every really thoughtful superior mind must become conscious, of His true worth? He would not have taken so bold a step without some hesitation, for, as has been noted,[3] He was humble of heart, and not presumptuous.[4] He

[1] Vide infra, chap. i, § 3. [2] Luke iii, 15; John i, 20, 25.
[3] Mark ii, 15–17; Matt. viii, 20; xi, 29; Luke ix, 58.
[4] Holtzmann, Bewusstsein, p. 81.

would only have done it after fervent prayer, invoking guidance from above to enable Him to judge His inner life and His conduct aright. He ended by believing that God's gifts to Him and the Divine Will shewed that the new path disclosed to Him was to be His destined course. The Messiahship, then, was to Him an act of faith—not faith in Himself, but in God, of Whom alone He expected the Messianic kingdom, as we have seen, and Whose faithful servant He desired to be. Like the prophets of old who were such an inspiration to Him, He attributed to God alone His superior powers, and He had no other thought than to use them to the glory of God and the salvation of the world.

4. The Predictions of Jesus' Death and Resurrection.

According to Mark's Gospel, when the question of His Messiahship was raised at Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus appended to it the prediction of His death ; He must have made some allusion to it even prior to that, for upon the point of fasting He had declared that the time would come when He, the bridegroom of the great Messianic banquet, would be taken from His guests, and that then they would fast,[1] which is evidently an anticipation here, and not authentic.[2] Another anticipation of the same kind occurs at the close of the story of the man with the withered hand whom Jesus had cured, where it is related that the Pharisees and the Herodians took counsel together,

[1] Mark ii, 20.

[2] Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, p. 342 ; Wellhausen, J. Weiss and Loisy on this passage ; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 48–9.

how they might destroy Him.[1] Following these passing allusions there comes the Lord's formal announcement that He would have much to suffer, that He would be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, that He would be killed and rise again after three days, and Peter, wishing to dissuade Him from such a melancholy fate, was severely rebuked by Him.[2] This sad prediction seems to have been repeated shortly afterwards upon two occasions, with more precise and detailed information concerning His Passion.[3]

Such statements are evidently dominated by a theological and apologetic bias. They are intended to show that the Christ foresaw His tragic end and that this consequently formed part of God's plan. The Evangelist, in his strongly Pauline view, doubtless wishes to combine this justification of the sufferings and death of Jesus with another preconceived idea, and demonstrate that the apostles, who were Jewish-Christians, were very slow to comprehend the mystery of His death and resurrection, for another favourite and purely theoretical theme of his is the lack of intelligence shewn by the first apostles concerning the Passion and other features of the Gospel.[4] Moreover, we cannot quote the exact words that Jesus must have used relating to His death and resurrection, and the statements in question have been formulated only after the accomplished facts. We know, on the

[1] Mark iii, 6. Cf. Holtzmann, J. Weiss and Loisy upon this.
[2] Mark viii, 31–3.
[3] Mark ix, 31 ; x, 33.
[4] Mark iv, 13 ; vi, 52 ; viii, 17, 21, 32–3 ; ix, 6, 10, 19, 32. Cf. x, 10, 38 ; xiv, 4–9, 37–40 ; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 945, 1004–6, etc. ; ibid., Evangile selon Marc, pp. 17–19, etc. ; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 81–2.

contrary, that these same facts were a matter of great astonishment to the apostles, and this would not have been the case if Jesus had spoken of them so clearly and urgently. We see, too, that on the very eve of His death Jesus was far from having any very distinct prevision of His future fate; He does not speak of His death or of His resurrection, but of the near approach of the Kingdom of God.[1] Then there is contradiction with regard to the setting of the statements in question. Jesus had in fact just forbidden the apostles to say that He was the Messiah,[2] and He is afterwards supposed to give Himself out as such by publicly taking the title of Son of Man and by a precise definition of His Messianic future.[3]

In other passages Jesus is reputed to have foreseen and predicted His death, attributing to it a redeeming power;[4] but these texts do not appear to be authentic either.[5] If such prevision and prediction seem to be inspired by Apostolic theology, in which the redeeming power of Jesus' blood bears so great a part, here is one fact which that theology would not have invented, which even controverts it, but which is none the less historically accurate. At the moment when Jesus repaired to Gethsemane with His disciples, He

[1] Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 16, 18.

[2] Mark viii, 30.

[3] Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 359–61, 393, 676–7; Loisy on Mark viii, 31–3; ix, 31; x, 33–4; Nicolardot, pp. 272–4; Goguel, Marc, pp. 171–3, 208–9; ibid., Eucharistie, pp. 48–50, 66–7; Coulange, Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuses, 1912, pp. 455–8. Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 553, note 1; Barbier, p. 123 et seq.

[4] Mark x, 38–9, 45; xii, 6–11; xiv, 8–9, 24, 27–8, 34–6

[5] Loisy on these passages; Pfleiderer, op. cit., i, pp 371–2, 375–6, 384–8, 677–84; Goguel, op. cit., pp. 203-5, 254–66; Barbier, pp. 128–38.

urgently desired them to provide themselves with swords, which they did.[1] This proves that Jesus, far from having for some time been aware that He was about to meet the death which was to redeem man and save the world, wished to avoid death, if He could, and had even contemplated defending Himself against possible aggressors.[2]

Here we must refer once more to the account of the Transfiguration. We are told that, six days after the scene at Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus took Peter, James and John up into a high mountain where He was transfigured before them; His garments became exceeding white and glistening; Elias and Moses appeared and talked with Jesus; Peter proposed making three tabernacles, one for Jesus, one for Moses, and one for Elias, but without knowing what he said; then there came a cloud, and a voice proceeding from it said: "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him." And suddenly looking round about, they saw no one any more, save Jesus only. And as they were coming down from the mountain, the Master forbade the three disciples to tell anyone what they had seen until after His resurrection. They observed His prohibition, but questioned among themselves what the words relating to His resurrection might mean.[3] Here is a summary of Loisy's careful observations upon this matter.

Christ's transfiguration is intimately bound up with the prediction of His passion and resurrection. It corrects the perspective of that scene of anguish and

[1] Luke xxii, 36, 38.

[2] Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 642–3, 684–7; ibid., Entstehung, pp. 104–6; Holtzmann and Loisy on Luke xxii, 35–8.

[3] Mark ix, 2–10.

forms the prelude to a scene of triumph. Thus it presents itself as the celestial corroboration of the Messianic confession of faith made by Peter. Jesus takes with Him the three disciples who enjoyed His special confidence. They are the same as those present at the raising of Jairus' daughter, and later in the agony in the garden of Gethsemane.[1] In all three cases their testimony is to vouch for a significant fact unknown to the other disciples. The three accounts show the dominance of the theological bias. The transfiguration and the scene at Gethsemane tend to cancel the horror of the Cross and to shew that the Galilean apostles had not comprehended the mystery of Jesus' redeeming death. He is not alone; in the radiance of His future glory appear Moses and Elijah, the two greatest figures of the Old Testament, who bow before the Son of Man. It is the Law and the Prophets paying homage to the Gospel. It was believed that Moses had spoken of the Messiah,[2] and that Elijah was to be His messenger.[3] Moreover, Elijah had not suffered death,[4] and Moses, not having been buried in the ground,[5] must have enjoyed a like privilege; their appearance then seemed all the more natural. Peter desires to erect three tabernacles, one for Christ, and one each for Moses and Elijah, but he is believed not to have known what he was saying. He still does not comprehend that Jesus must die, to fulfil prophecy; he desires to see the Messiah at once in all His glory, and to keep Him there with His witnesses. The appearance of the cloud overshadowing them, which betokens the presence of God, brings the vision to an end.

[1] Mark v, 37; xiv, 33.
[2] Deut. xviii, 15.
[3] Mal. iii, 1, 23–4.
[4] 2 Kings ii, 11.
[5] Deut. xxxiv, 6.

The first picture presents the glorified Jesus between the great lawgiver and the great prophet ; the second presents God Himself, bearing testimony to Christ, more significant and more authoritative than any human witness, by declaring Him His well-beloved Son, whom they must hear. Jesus Christ, greater than Moses or Elijah, is henceforth the guide and master whom men are to obey. If this account corrects the perspective of the scene at Gethsemane, it completes that of the Baptism, the revelation made on that occasion to the Christ by the Father, being now made to the disciples. Jesus then forbids the disciples to tell anyone what they have witnessed until the Son of Man be risen from the dead. In fact the picture is meaningless except in relation to the glory of the risen Christ ; it is in accordance with the conceptions of the Christian community, and would have had no significance for the apostles during the ministry of Jesus. We are led to suspect, therefore, that the Evangelists helped this recital to take shape in Christian tradition, and that the historical witnesses of the life of Jesus had not been aware of it. Finally, it is said that the disciples did not understand that the Messiah would need to rise from the dead. Such blindness is improbable if the data of the Second Gospel are to be regarded as historical. The hand which edited this account is the one which on several occasions laid stress upon the incapacity of the Galilean apostles to conceive of the mystery of salvation through the death and resurrection of the Christ.[1]

[1] These are Loisy's views. Cf. Holtzmann on this account ; Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 363–6, 690–1 ; Carpenter, The First Three Gospels, 4th ed., pp. 145–51 ; Goguel, Marc, pp. 177–89, 209.

Did Jesus Himself never contemplate His ultimate and even violent death? That is a point it is not easy to admit, seeing the obstacles and opposition which His ministry encountered in certain circles, the defection He experienced with so many people, and above all the hatred and active hostility shewn by their leaders. He was not so simple as to lose sight of His own melancholy experiences, or the recent tragic death of John the Baptist,[1] following upon many similar cases among the prophets of old.[2] The following fact, too, is doubly significant. The *Logia*, the most ancient source of the Gospels which we possess, does not contain a single word about the death of Jesus, which confirms the correctness of the views we have noted, but at the same time we do find there, among the sayings of Jesus, significant warnings of the hostility which will await the disciples in their turn during their work of evangelization.[3] Would not Our Lord, therefore, believe that He would encounter similar enmity and equal difficulties in going to Jerusalem? Assuredly He would.[4] But did He also foresee His death and regard it as part of the plan provided by God for the salvation of the world? This is one of the most difficult questions to answer, and one of the most keenly debated.[5] In any case, Jesus had no idea that He would have to offer Himself as a sacrifice to God to secure this salvation.[6]

[1] Mark ix, 13. [2] Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34.

[3] Matt. v, 11–12; x, 19–20, 26–39; Luke vi, 22–3; xii, 2–9, 51–3; xiv, 26–7; xvii, 33.

[4] Cf. Matt. xxiii, 27–39; Luke xi, 44, 47–51; xiii, 34–5.

[5] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 353 et seq. Cf. Barbier, p. 123 et seq.

[6] Barbier, pp. 128–39.

CHAPTER VI

THE LAST PHASE OF JESUS' MINISTRY

1. Chronological Points and Other General Considerations.

Since a wider comprehension of the genesis and true character of the Gospels has recently proved that efforts to write a Life of Jesus, such as those so often attempted in the last century, are far from satisfactory in their results, we have not essayed it here. These chapters have been put together to achieve a religious and moral end; their aim is practical rather than strictly historical. They leave much to be desired, therefore, from the chronological, topographical and allied points of view. At most we can distinguish here to some extent, though not without difficulty, between the first and specially Galilean period of Jesus' ministry, and the second period, spent in Jerusalem (if it be permissible to call Jesus' brief sojourn in or near Jerusalem at the close of His earthly career, a *period* of His ministry). If we attach any importance to this point, we might consider the first period closed prior to the scene at Cæsarea Philippi, when the question of Jesus' Messiahship was raised; but in our opinion it is a very secondary

matter, and such a course would be productive of further difficulty. Here, at any rate, are some notes with respect to these minor points.

From the episode of the Canaanitish woman we learn that Jesus once went to the borders of Tyre and Sidon,[1] but we know nothing else about this journey. The Evangelist does indeed relate that on His return towards the Sea of Galilee or Lake of Gennesaret, He crossed the district of Decapolis [2] which extends from the east of the lake and of the Jordan, but the sequel reveals nothing important concerning the ministry which Jesus must have exercised in those parts. Then, again, we find Our Lord at Bethsaida, a city on the northern side of the lake, and we are simply told that He healed a blind man there.[3] Later, we are informed, He and His disciples went into the villages near Cæsarea Philippi,[4] a town situated near the source of the Jordan. But there is no question of any activity whatever on the part of Jesus in these localities or in the region in general; the Evangelist merely relates the discourse held there by Jesus with His disciples about His Messiahship, His death and resurrection, as we have already seen.[5] Later still, we see the Lord entering a house,[6] but its locality is not mentioned. Then He passes through Galilee with His disciples, not wishing that anyone should know

[1] Mark vii, 24–40.

[2] Mark vii, 31. Neither Matthew nor Luke makes any mention of this.

[3] Mark viii, 22–6. This story is not given by the other Synoptics, though Jesus must often have exercised His ministry at Bethsaida: Matt. xi, 21; Luke x, 13.

[4] Mark viii, 27. Luke makes no mention of this.

[5] See chap. v, § 5.

[6] Mark ix, 28. Luke preserves silence upon this point also.

it, and arrives at Capernaum,[1] which is His principal place of abode during the Galilean period of His ministry. At this time He was doubtless anxious to remain unknown, that He might not draw down upon Himself the notice of Herod, who saw in Him John the Baptist risen from the dead, and might have been inclined to deal harshly with him.[2] Finally He goes into the borders of Judea and to the eastern bank of the Jordan, to Peræa, where multitudes came together to hear His teaching.[3] According to Luke's Gospel, Jesus desired to pass through Samaria on His way to Jerusalem, but meeting with an unfavourable reception in one of the Samaritan villages, He changed His route.[4] Finally the Master and His disciples are on the way, going up to Jerusalem,[5] and passing through Jericho He cured a blind man.[6] After that, He arrives at Jerusalem, but without making the triumphal entry of tradition.[7]

From this brief review we find that we possess but scanty and often incomplete information concerning a number of questions relating to Jesus' ministry. The statement just made, which sets forth the principal facts and groups them according to their matter rather than their chronological order, seems therefore amply justified. At most we can distinguish between

[1] Mark ix, 30, 33. Neither Matthew nor Luke speaks of this arrival at Capernaum; the latter says nothing about Galilee either.

[2] Mark vi, 14–16. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 125–8.

[3] Mark x, 1. This notice is omitted by Luke.

[4] Luke ix, 52–6. For this journey to Jerusalem, see Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 99–102.

[5] Mark x, 32.

[6] Mark x, 46–52.

[7] Mark xi, 1–11. See Loisy's commentary on this account in L'Evangile selon Marc, pp. 315–20.

a first period or phase of this ministry, in which Jesus is mainly predicting the near approach of the Kingdom of God and the conditions of entry therein, a time during which He is received with enthusiasm and frequently surrounded by large crowds, and then a second phase in which the Pharisees offer the most determined opposition, in which He Himself seems to withdraw from the earlier scene of His activity and seek, more or less, for solitude or for occasions of being alone with His disciples.[1]

In spite of the disappointments Jesus had experienced during His ministry, it was not in any pessimistic vein, as we pointed out in concluding our last chapter, that He went up to Jerusalem. His unbounded confidence in God, and the assurance of the righteousness of His cause, prevented that. Let us remember, too, that in His eyes the establishment of the Kingdom of God in no way depended upon human moods or actions, as some have often thought, but solely upon God, Who is to inaugurate His definite reign upon earth by His power alone, and that for the benefit of those who are rightly disposed, even if they be but a "little flock",[2] for though many are called, few are chosen.[3] The good tidings having been sufficiently diffused in Galilee, it behoved Him to carry it also, and above all, to Jerusalem, which would necessarily be the central point of the Kingdom according to the Israelitish expectation, and to Jesus' own view. If the earthly Jerusalem failed, it must be replaced by a new and heavenly Jerusalem, which

[1] Upon the first period of Jesus' activities, the reader will do well to consult Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 207–13. They were exercised mainly upon the north-east of the Lake of Tiberias, at Capernaum and the surrounding districts.

[2] Luke xii, 32. [3] Matt. xxii, 14.

actually existed in Jewish thought, whence it has passed into the Christian belief.[1] This ideal Jerusalem, then, was also the work of God, and not of man, like the Kingdom of God, of which it was to be the centre and crowning point.

This is the reason why Jesus, after His evangelizing journeys into Galilee and the neighbouring districts, feels no desire to linger on His way, but hastens to reach the Holy City. To the disciples, impatient for the dawn of the eternal and glorious day, He promises that when the Son of Man shall be seated on His throne of glory, they too shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.[2] It was with this brilliant prospect in view that Jesus repaired to Jerusalem, not with any idea of dying for the salvation of the world, a view which could only be tenable, and so long maintained, under the influence of theology which entirely failed to understand the really authentic sentiments of the Jesus of history. No doubt, after having already had frequent contests with the scribes and Pharisees in Galilee, He could, and would, expect that the sacerdotal and Sadducean party in Jerusalem would oppose Him strenuously since He never ceased to exalt true piety, which was essentially ethical, above all ritual acts. But He was persuaded that, in case of need, God could put twelve legions of angels at His disposal to shield and protect Him from all dangers.[3]

When the Passover drew near Jesus went to Jerusalem, partly, no doubt, that He might keep the feast there in accordance with the Law,[4] but mainly

[1] Rev. xxi, 9–xxiii, 5. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 213–4.
[2] Matt. xix, 27–8; Luke xxii, 29–30. [3] Matt. xxvi, 53.
[4] Exod. xxiii, 17; xxxiv, 23; Deut. xvi, 16.

that He would thus have an opportunity of preaching the Gospel to the assembled crowds of pilgrims who, following the usual custom, flocked thither from all parts of Palestine, and even from Jewish centres throughout the world. All Jesus' conduct in the Holy City confirms this supposition, and we shall see Him, both in the Temple and its vicinity, always engaged in exhorting and instructing the masses or disputing with their spiritual guides. Peter's avowal of His Messiahship will have largely contributed to this course of action, since it made Him more conscious of His authority, His true vocation and the necessity of pleading God's cause before an immense, unique public such as He would have found nowhere else. In that place, above all, was it necessary that the ideal of the prophets of old should triumph. Just as Amos went to Bethel, a great centre of worship, to denounce the empty ritual which flourished most conspicuously in the ancient priestly sanctuaries,[1] so Our Lord felt impelled to oppose to the purely external worship of Jerusalem, worship in spirit and in truth. The example of the select few among other prophets would also induce Him to follow this course. We know that Jeremiah, for instance, having begun his work of reformation at Anathoth, where he was born, soon transferred his activity to Jerusalem, and there, with intense energy and indefatigable zeal, he combated the vain and formal religion countenanced by shallow-minded priests and kings. We remember, too, that he was not only subjected to violent persecution, but that he even risked losing his life there upon one occasion.[2]

As an explanation of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem,

[1] Amos vii, 10 et seq. [2] Jer. xxxvi–xxxviii.

the following well-grounded suggestion has been put forward : " It was essential that He should come to the capital, for there alone, by reason of the importance of Jerusalem to Israel (an importance that was more religious than political), could the fate of a ministry such as His be decided. In Galilee, neither success nor failure could be final. The most complete failure could be repaired by success in Jerusalem, and the most pronounced success would be of no value if not ratified in Judea. The very logic of the situation would lead Jesus to the capital of theocracy, either to appeal against His failure, or to be assured of His success.[1]

2. Jesus' Activities in Jerusalem.

The first episode which occurred at Jerusalem helps to confirm the preceding remarks. Jesus indeed began by driving from the Court of the Temple the traders and money-changers who were to be found there.[2] Every year at the Passover, the approaches to the Temple were thronged by merchants prepared to sell to the Jews from a distance all things necessary for the offerings : wine, salt, meal, incense, and the various kinds of animals destined for sacrifice. To this end a veritable market had been established in the part of the Temple called the Court of the Gentiles, to which the heathen had access. And since the Greek and Roman specie used in ordinary barter were not permissible for Temple offerings in money, there were to be found in addition changers who

[1] Goguel, Eucharistie, pp. 66–7, Cf. Pfleiderer, Entstehung, pp. 102–3.

[2] Mark xi, 15–18.

accepted the ordinary coinage and, retaining a certain percentage, provided the national money which alone was received in the Sacred Treasury. Thus the Court of the Gentiles really resembled a bazaar, with the noise and the paraphernalia of the ordinary markets.

When Jesus beheld this He was indignant, for He held this noisy chaffering to be a desecration of the House of God. He therefore began to drive out the sellers and buyers; He overturned the tables of the money-changers and the stalls of the traders, explaining His action to the crowds assembled there by declaring that the House of God was a house of prayer, and not the place for extortionate bargaining, which turned it into a den of robbers. Warranted in His action by the prophets of old, who constantly made a stand against the materialism in religion of the ancient Israelites, Jesus would have had no desire to inveigh against the Temple worship itself, but only against the profanation of it by the trafficking in question, which offended His pure and exalted religious feeling. He was quite well able to predict the downfall of the Temple as a consequence of the world-catastrophe He expected,[1] without on that account being indifferent to the respect due to the House of God. Nevertheless, it is natural that the priests, as responsible for the Temple, and the scribes, the guardians of the Law and the tradition of the elders, should, as we learn, have conceived the design of ridding themselves of Jesus by putting Him to death, for they saw in His conduct only a revolutionary act which deserved the most severe rebuke. They dared not, however, arrest Him on the spot, because the people were so strongly interested in His

[1] Mark xiii, 1–2.

preaching.[1] He seems to have continued His discourses until the evening, when He left the city only to spend the night on the Mount of Olives, whence He returned each morning to preach in the Temple.[2]

The day following the expulsion of the traders, when Jesus returned to the Court of the Temple, the chief priests, scribes, and elders, i.e., the members of the Jewish Sanhedrim, asked Him by what authority He did these things, and who had given Him authority to act as if He were the sovereign lord of the Temple.[3] They hoped in this way to force Jesus to declare that he was the Messiah, or at any rate that He came in God's name, since He had no mission from the established authorities. He declared His readiness to answer them, if they would first tell Him their opinion of the baptism of John, whether they regarded it as from heaven or of men. This question was put to embarrass His interlocutors. At heart they did not believe that John the Baptist had been sent by God, but it was easy to perceive that they dared not risk a negative reply, or they would arouse the people against them, since these held John to be a true prophet. Therefore they could only remain silent or else admit, contrary to their belief, that John's mission was from heaven. But in that case their reply would furnish Jesus with the means of putting them to confusion because they had not listened to

[1] Mark xi, 18; Luke xix, 47–8.

[2] Mark xi, 19; Luke xxi, 37–8. Cf. Loisy on this part of the subject; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, p. 91. Jesus spent the nights on the Mount of Olives, and not at Bethany, as stated in Mark xi, 11–12, and xiv, 3. J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium, p. 283–4, 387; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 96; ii, p. 546; Goguel, Marc, pp. 215–20, 249–50; ibid., Eucharistie, p. 67.

[3] Mark xi, 27–33.

John the Baptist, and to escape this result, which would have presented them in an unfavourable light, they resolved to keep silence. Jesus took advantage of this silence of theirs, and gave no reply to the insidious question propounded to Him by the Sanhedrim.[1]

According to Matthew's account, Jesus then related the following parable: "A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. He answered and said, I will not; but afterward he repented, and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir; and went not. Whether of the twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."[2]

Although the members of the Sanhedrim, interrogating Jesus about the power He claimed, did not succeed in obtaining a compromising answer from Him, they did not consider themselves beaten, and soon afterwards sent people to question Him on a very delicate matter, the payment of tribute to Cæsar.[3] Some of the Pharisees and Herodians were charged with this inquiry. The Herodians belonged to the political party which desired that Judea, instead of being governed by the Romans, should be under the rule of a prince of the semi-national Herodian dynasty. In this instance they could join with the Pharisees, for the latter, in spite of having little liking for the house of Herod, would yet give it the prefer-

[1] Cf. Loisy on Mark xi, 27–33.
[2] Matt. xxi, 28–31. Cf. Loisy on this passage.
[3] Mark xii, 13–17.

ence over foreign rule. The question relating to the tribute money was peculiarly insidious; it seemed as if any decision whatever must inevitably compromise Jesus. Most of the Jews paid the Roman tax very unwillingly, their inward conviction being that they owed Cæsar nothing. Since the idea of the Messianic rule was bound up with that of national independence in their minds, Jesus' interlocutors imagined that He would not sanction submission to foreign authority by approving the payment of the tribute money, for if He did, He would be repudiating the hope of the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God, and this would ruin Him in public opinion. On the other hand, if He pronounced against it, His enemies had but to denounce Him to the government, and He would be arrested by the Roman police, a consummation desired by the Sanhedrim.

This Machiavellian design was frustrated by Our Lord's adroit reply, however. After having made His questioners realize that He perceived their treacherous scheme, He asks them to shew Him a penny, a piece of the coinage in use in the country, with the emperor's effigy stamped upon it. He then obliges His interlocutors themselves to own that the head and inscription upon it represent the emperor, saying that one should render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's. He thereby gives them to understand that political submission, shewn by the payment of tribute, neither contradicts nor cancels the submission due to God, the one duty in no way hindering the other. This implies that the Kingdom of God is not to be brought about by violence, or revolt against established order; while awaiting it, they must give Cæsar the dues his

position requires, and it would be foolish to think that it could in any way be to the interest of God or His kingdom, were they to deny an obligation of this kind. Moreover, the Kingdom of God being close at hand, such an obligation would of itself shortly cease. Absolutely taken aback by such an unexpected reply, the questioners felt themselves beaten, and took care henceforward not to involve themselves in argument with a disputant who displayed such intellectual superiority.[1]

The evening having come, Jesus withdrew to the Mount of Olives, whence He returned next morning to the Temple, where the people gathered about Him, and sitting down among them, He taught them. Then the scribes and Pharisees brought unto Him a woman taken in adultery; "and when they had set her in the midst they say unto Him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the Law commanded that such should be stoned; but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting Him, that they might have wherewith to accuse Him. But Jesus stooped down, and with His finger wrote on the ground. . . . So when they continued asking Him, He lifted up Himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. And again He stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up Himself, and saw none but the woman, He said unto her, Woman,

[1] See Loisy on Mark xii, 13–17; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, pp. 92–3.

where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more." [1]

The Sadducees in their turn come to ask Jesus concerning the resurrection from the dead, with an evident desire to embarrass Him and discredit His authority with the crowd.[2] They did not believe in the resurrection, as Jesus and so many of the Jews of His time did. The story they come to relate is a fictitious one calculated to combat this belief. They suppose the existence of seven brothers marrying the same woman in succession, by virtue of the Levirate law,[3] in order to compel Jesus to say whose wife she would be in a future life. Jesus deems that the Sadducees' question simply shews that they do not know what they are talking about. His answer amounts to this. It is not true that the doctrine of the resurrection leads to conclusions which are absurd; it is not true that the Law is unaware of, or rejects, this doctrine, as the Sadducees imagine. The absurdity they think they find in the idea of the resurrection arises out of their false conception of the state of those who rise from the dead. They suppose them to be once more married, whereas in the heavenly kingdom, where all enjoy immortal life, marriage no longer exists. They have an imperfect idea of God's power if they imagine that He cannot raise the dead

[1] John vii, 53–viii, 11. This extract, which is virtually an interpolation in the Fourth Gospel, probably first formed part of Mark's original gospel in the place we assign to it here; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, p. 93; Loisy on this passage, and Synoptiques, i, pp. 98, 217–18; ii, pp. 337, 456, note 2.

[2] Mark xii, 18–27.

[3] Deut. xxv, 5–6. Cf. Gen. xxxviii, 8.

without giving them bodies like those they have had on earth. The life of the risen will be a new and higher type of life. As to the objection drawn from the Scriptures, it, too, fails to hold good. Far from its ignoring or gainsaying immortality and the resurrection, there is positive teaching in the Law upon both doctrines. In the story of the burning bush they read how God indeed said to Moses: "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."[1] Now He would not have said that He was the God of people who were not in existence; He could only be the God of those who were actually alive, therefore the patriarchs continue to live after death. This reasoning may appear somewhat imperfect to our minds, but it was the view current at the time of Jesus, and it satisfied His questioners. Moreover, believers in a personal God would have good reason to say that those who have lived for God can never be dead in His sight.[2]

Mark supposes one of the scribes to have heard this conversation between Jesus and the Sadducees. Since the Pharisees maintained the belief in the resurrection against the latter party, they could but feel gratified that their opponents should have been silenced thus, and one of the scribes must have felt emboldened to question Jesus on a point which was held to be of importance in the discussions of the Schools—the decision as to which was the greatest commandment in the Law. Jesus answers him by quoting the passages from Deuteronomy and Leviticus which refer to the love of God and of one's neighbour.[3]

[1] Ex. iii, 6, 15–16.
[2] Cf. Loisy on Mark xii, 18–27; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, p. 93.
[3] Deut. v, 4–5; Lev. xix, 18.

These, said Jesus, are the two great commandments, upon which all the others depend.[1]

Jesus having reduced to silence all who desired to question Him, now took the offensive Himself, and propounded a doctrinal point held by the scribes, in order to shew its inconsistency. The scribes taught that a son of David would re-establish the national independence, and reign in glory in Jerusalem. This conception is not tenable in face of the witness of David himself who, in one of the psalms written under Divine inspiration, calls the Messiah his Lord. If the Messiah is but a son of David and a king like his ancestor, David had no reason to call him Lord. Why then did he do it? Such is the question with which Jesus embarrasses the Pharisees. David was right in expressing himself thus, because the Messiah is more than a son of David and a king of Israel. This was the conclusion to which Jesus desired to bring His hearers, because He knew Himself to be greater than Solomon or Jonas,[2] and consequently greater than David.[3] The beginning of Psalm cx, quoted by Jesus to the scribes, expresses ardent desires for a king of Israel, not predictions concerning the king of the future. It is true that the spirit of the psalm is a Messianic one, and it expresses the hopes of Israel. But the Jews in the first century of this era saw in this psalm, as in nearly all the rest, David's personal utterances, and applied the words to the Messiah. Jesus quotes it, and argues from it in

[1] Mark xii, 28–34. Cf. Matt. xxii, 34–40; Luke x, 25–8. This passage is not entirely original in any of the Gospels, and probably not one of them gives it in its right place: Loisy on this extract; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, pp. 93–4. Cf. Goguel, Marc, pp. 223–5.

[2] Matt. xii, 41; Luke xi, 31–2.

[3] Mark xii, 35–7.

accordance with this view, as He generally does in cases of this kind. From His statements on this occasion we may infer that He personally did not consider Himself a descendant of David, and that He thus waived or anticipated the objection to His Messiahship which might be derived from this circumstance. His argument signifies that the Christ has no need to be a son of David, and that His dignity proceeds from a loftier source. The solution He asked for not being considered possible by the scribes, no one answered Him.[1]

Finally Jesus made a searching indictment of the Pharisees. It is not in its right place in our Gospels, but certainly belongs to the final days of His ministry, for at its end He takes a sort of leave of His hearers, as if He would see them no more before the advent of the Messiah.[2] These are the most authentic portions of this indictment: "The Pharisees bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne and lay them on men's shoulders, but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. They seek the chief seats in the synagogues and greetings in the markets. Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, and mercy. Ye Pharisees, ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Woe unto you! for ye are like whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful

[1] Cf. Loisy on Mark xii, 35–7; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, pp. 94–5.
[2] Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 366, 384.

outwardly, but within are full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. Woe unto you! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes, and some of them ye shall kill and persecute, that upon you may come all the blood which was shed from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias whom ye slew between the altar and the temple. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." [1]

The anecdote which follows forms an agreeable contrast with the severe denunciation which preceded it, for here is seen once again how keenly Jesus appreciated faithfulness in little things, carried through in singleness of heart. Being seated over against the Temple Treasury, Our Lord beheld the people casting money into it. Many that were rich cast in much, " and there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites which make a farthing.

[1] Matt. xxiii, 4, 6–7, 13, 23, 25, 27, 29–31, 34–9; Luke xi, 39, 42–4, 46–52; xiii, 34–5. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 364–90; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, p. 95.

And He called unto Him His disciples, and saith to them, Verily I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury; for they all did cast in of their abundance, but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living." [1]

As Jesus went out of the Temple, one of His disciples saith unto Him, "Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here! Jesus said unto him, This temple shall be destroyed, and I will raise it up in three days." [2] The disciples seem to have asked when these things should happen, to which Jesus replied that neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but God alone knew the day and the hour when these things should be.[3]

The rest of the great apocalyptic discourse contained in Matthew's thirteenth chapter is undoubtedly not authentic, except the small portion borrowed from the *Logia* and preserved in a more primitive and complete form by Matthew and Luke.[4] Here is the passage, as one can reconstruct it from the two Gospels. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together. And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and

[1] Mark xii, 41–4.

[2] Mark xiii, 1–2. Cf. xiv, 58; xv, 29; John ii, 19; Loisy on Mark xiii, 1–2.

[3] Mark xiii, 3–4, 32.

[4] Mark xiii, 33–7. Cf. Holtzmann, Synoptiker, pp. 95–7; ibid., Theologie, i, pp. 399–405; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 98–9; ii, pp. 393–451. Cf. Goguel, Marc, pp. 228–48.

drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left. Two women shall be grinding together at the mill; the one shall be taken and the other left.[1] Know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is the servant whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him rule over all his goods. But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at a time when he is not aware, and will cut him asunder, and will appoint him his portion with the hypocrites." [2]

[1] Matt. xxiv, 27–8, 37–41; Luke xvii, 24, 26–7, 37.
[2] Matt. xxiv, 43–51; Luke xii, 39–40, 42–6.

CHAPTER VII

JESUS' PASSION AND RESURRECTION

1. The Betrayal and the Lord's Supper.

The chief priests and the scribes, desiring to be rid of Jesus, sought to accomplish their purpose by cunning, for they dared not arrest Him openly on account of the tumult it would have occasioned among the populace, of whom at least a part, notably the Galilean pilgrims, were His adherents. The Passover was but two days distant when the most important of the hierarchs and the scribes, members of the Sanhedrim, decided to take the necessary measures to attain their end.[1] At that very time one of the Twelve, Judas Iscariot, began to enter into negotiations to deliver Jesus into their hands. They promised him a sum of money, and it was agreed that the traitor should advise them when he found an opportunity of having Him taken without arousing the suspicion of the crowd.[2] It is probable that the faithless disciple had already had secret conferences with Our Lord's enemies during the preceding days when Jesus was preaching in the Temple. The question of money will have played some part in this deed of his, but it was not from mere avarice that

[1] Mark xiv, 1–2. Cf. Loisy on this passage.
[2] Mark xiv, 10–11.

Judas betrayed his master. He had assuredly ceased to believe in His Messiahship. He must have believed in it at first, and shewn his zeal for the Gospel message, or he would not have been chosen one of the Twelve. At the time of his calling he must have been of like mind with the other apostles. But everything proves that he rebelled against the teaching which Jesus gave His disciples. He could not understand in the least why Jesus should run any risk of death, when it might be avoided. Perhaps, too, he, in advance of the other disciples, was aware of the ever-increasing peril that surrounded Him who would be the Christ. Thus he foresaw the shattering of all those high hopes and fair dreams of his, which had envisaged the Messiah, glorious and triumphant, overcoming His enemies and distributing riches and honours to His friends. Judas' act of treason would undoubtedly afford him a means of extricating himself from a false position. Like the judges and the executioners of Jesus, he could not have been fully conscious of his crime. Foreseeing his master's death, he may have felt beforehand the fear which seized the other disciples only in face of the accomplished fact, and, as frequently happens in such a case, he may not have realized the vileness of his conduct until after the deed of blood.[1]

According to the Synoptic Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles, Jesus again celebrated the Paschal feast with His disciples on the eve of His death, and then He instituted the Lord's Supper.[2] This question of

[1] Loisy on Mark xiv, 10–11; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, p. 98; Brandt, Evangelische Geschichte, p. 483 et seq.; Goguel, Eucharistie, pp. 67–74.

[2] Mark xiv, 12–25 and parallels; 1 Cor. xi, 23–6.

the Institution has raised overwhelming difficulties, provoked innumerable differences of opinion, and resulted in an extraordinary wealth of literature.[1] The historical aspect of the problem tends to become simpler, however, since it has been established that Mark, our oldest evangelist, who served as a source for the other two, was already strongly influenced by Paulinism in this respect as in many others.[2] Another point of capital importance in this matter, too, is the confirmation by Luke (with many later additions) of the oldest account of Jesus' last supper, given in the following words: "And He took the cup and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come. And He took bread and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them."[3] A great many difficulties still exist with regard to this question, however, and first of all is the determining the exact date upon which Jesus took His last meal with His disciples. For the elucidation of this point we must first fix the day of Jesus' death.

According to the unanimous tradition of the Early Church, Jesus was put to death on a Friday,[4] and if

[1] Holtzmann, Theologie, p. 364 et seq.; Goguel, Eucharistie; Barbier, Sainte-Cène

[2] Holtzmann, Theologie, i, pp. 368–72; Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 387–8; Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 100, 116, 181; ii, p. 531 et seq.; Barbier, pp. 75 et seq., 119 et seq. Cf. Goguel, Marc, p. 257–66.

[3] Luke xxii, 17–19; Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 526–31; ibid., L'Evangile et l'Eglise, pp. 113–14; J. Weiss, Predigt, pp. 198–9; ibid., Das älteste Evangelium, pp. 291–9; ibid. on Mark xiv, 17–25, and Luke xxii, 7–23; Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 459–60, 680–4; Barbier, pp. 22–30, 33–40; Heitmüller, Taufe und Abendmahl, pp. 51–3.

[4] Mark xv, 42; Luke xxiii, 54; John xix, 31

He had really celebrated the Paschal feast with His disciples the day before, as we are told, He would have died on the first day of the Passover. But John's Gospel antedates both Jesus' last supper and His crucifixion by one day, and therefore the latter could not have taken place on the first day of the Passover feast, but the preceding day, the day of preparation for the festival,[1] and as a consequence Jesus' last meal would *not* have been the Paschal supper. Which of these accounts is historically correct? Possibly neither. In any case the Synoptics desired to make the institution of the Eucharist coincide with the Paschal feast, and the Fourth Gospel aims at making the death of Jesus coincide with the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, in order to present Jesus as the "Lamb of God", dying for the sins of the world.[2] This Gospel, again, portrays Jesus crucified and dying on the afternoon of the fourteenth day of Nisan,[3] at the time when the Paschal lamb was usually slain,[4] whilst Mark fixes the crucifixion at nine o'clock in the morning.[5] Independently of this, which is a disputed point,[6] it seems certain that Jesus was not put to death on the first day of the Passover, a feast day, but previously.[7]

Certain indications there are which go to prove that the last meal taken by Jesus with His disciples on the eve of His death was not a Paschal feast at all, for such a view of it rests solely upon a late and but slightly historical tradition of the second Gospel.[8]

[1] John xiii, 1 et seq., 29; xviii, 28; xix, 14, 31, 42.
[2] Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 506–8, 541–2. [3] John xix, 14.
[4] Ex. xii, 6. [5] Mark xv, 25. [6] Barbier, pp. 42–8.
[7] Ibid., pp. 49–66; Heitmüller, op. cit., pp. 46–7.
[8] Mark xiv, 12–16. Cf. J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium, pp. 287–90; ibid and Loisy on this passage.

During that meal, ordinary bread (*artos*) was eaten, and not unleavened bread,[1] which was an indispensable part of the Passover feast, although it was not distributed during the feast, but afterwards. The administering of the cup accompanying the distribution of the bread during the meal, too, formed no part of the Paschal repast, for the drinking of cups of wine marked, as it were, the intervals in the course of the meal. Finally, if Jesus had desired to make use of the Paschal feast to accomplish a special act, He would undoubtedly have connected it with the Paschal Lamb, the essential element of that feast, and not with the bread and wine, which were but accessories.[2] The idea advanced that Jesus must at least have intended to make the distribution of the bread a parable of the gift of Himself,[3] is also open to the most serious objections.[4]

It is certain that in His last meal Jesus was dominated by a presentiment of the near approach of the *dénouement* of the difficult situation in which He found Himself, seeing the hostility, greater even than ever, of His enemies towards Him. Thus in pronouncing, according to custom, words of benediction upon both bread and wine, He made it clear to His disciples that He was taking a meal with them for the last time under the old conditions. At the moment of passing round the cup, He indeed uttered these solemn and significant words: "I say unto you I

[1] Mark xiv, 22.

[2] Goguel, Eucharistie, pp. 59–65; Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 518–9; Heitmüller, loc. cit.; Barbier, pp. 67–74.

[3] Goguel, op. cit., pp. 83–8, 100–1, 287–8; Barbier, pp. 139–43.

[4] Loisy, Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuses, 1910, p. 597.

will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." [1]

Since things occurred thus at the last repast taken by Jesus, we can better understand the practice of breaking the bread in the Early Church, where it was not a question of the broken body of Jesus, nor of His blood shed, nor even of the Cup, and just as little of feelings of contrition or of pardon for sin, but of an act of gratitude towards God, seeing the expectation of the early return of Christ to inaugurate the Kingdom of God.[2] But these views, like many others held by the Early Christians, were afterwards very considerably modified by the apostle Paul, who made the atoning death of Jesus Christ the essential point of the work of salvation. This brought about many doctrinal and ritual innovations, and among them the transformation of the original breaking of bread in the Primitive Church.

Until now the principal concern of theologians regarding the Lord's Supper has been that of deciding upon Jesus' intention in instituting it, and the exact meaning which should attach to the words He uttered to that effect. This hotly debated controversial point exists no longer if Our Lord did not intend to institute such a rite and said nothing in that sense, as we have seen. Strictly speaking, the historian can be content to establish this fact, and leave to theological experts the task of determining the permanent value of the Eucharist. As, however, the "Breaking of Bread" is to be met with from the

[1] Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 18. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 218–19; ii, 538; Heitmüller, op. cit., pp. 47–8.

[2] Acts ii, 42, 46; xx, 7, 11; xxvii, 35; Luke xxiv, 35. Cf. Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 682 et seq.; Piepenbring, Jésus et les Apôtres, pp. 12–14; Heitmüller, op. cit., pp. 51–3.

very beginning of Christianity, it is permissible to suppose that it was not only in conformity with the Master's ideas, but has been inspired by Him. For this reason we must say a little more upon this subject.

From conclusions already formed, the significance of Jesus' last festal supper must be the same as that of the others which He was accustomed to take with His disciples and adherents, which possibly prefigured the Messianic banquet to which Jesus made allusions.[1] To understand these repasts we must also bear in mind the fact that sacred feasts have played an important part throughout antiquity and with the Israelites among the rest, for religion at that time was essentially traditional and collective in its character. Consequently, sacred feasts were the definite and joyful expression of the feeling of solidarity which united all devout participants among themselves and with their God.[2] In Judaism, which had already become more individualistic, feasts of this kind celebrated in independent societies (like that of the Essenes, for instance) took on a fresh character instead of ceasing to exist. Jesus, who freely cultivated the spirit of brotherly love among His disciples, would surely have been inspired by these customs in organizing the feasts in question. One certain proof of this is that originally the Christians were not fulfilling any act of worship in memory of the last repast of Jesus, but were holding the usual brotherly love-feasts such as He had had with His disciples during the course of His ministry.[3]

[1] Goguel, Eucharistie, p. 51 et seq.

[2] Smith, Die Religion der Semiten, pp. 196–205.

[3] Vide infra, chap. v, § 2; Piepenbring, Jésus et les Apôtres, pp. 12–14.

This explanation will doubtless appear more acceptable than that given by Lobstein who, identifying Jesus' last repast with the Paschal feast and seeing in it the formal institution of the Eucharist, concluded that the Jewish Christians in organizing their Agapes, were only imitating the sacred feasts of the Jews.[1] This in reality assumes that Jesus' immediate disciples deviated more or less from their Master's idea and that Paul, who had never heard His words, gave a more correct interpretation of it. We should say rather that the early disciples remained faithful to Jesus' standard, whilst Paul modified it, the better to adapt it to his own views. If the contrary seems to be true, it is but seeming only, and arises out of the fact that the Evangelists put the Pauline doctrine into the mouth of Jesus in this respect, as in so many others.

Jesus' last feast with His disciples, then, must have been of an essentially fraternal character, like the early Christian love-feasts. It is altogether unlikely that Our Lord wished to establish a special communion between Himself and His disciples thereby. In no passage which is undoubtedly authentic did He make the slightest allusion to such a communion, nor do we find any trace of it in the Primitive Church. It appears for the first time in Paul's epistles. Far from establishing any mystic communion between Himself and His disciples at His last supper, Jesus declares that the Kingdom of God will come immediately and will allow Him to partake anew of the everlasting feast with them.[2] The idea of this

[1] Lobstein, La doctrine de la Sainte Cène, p. 88 et seq.

[2] Luke xxii, 18, 30; Mark xiv, 25. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 538–40.

communion, in the sense given to it by Paul, and the Pauline doctrine of atonement, are really inspired by the old Mystery-religions.[1]

When Jesus declared towards the end of His last repast, that the Kingdom of God was nearer than ever, there was dissension among the apostles concerning those who should occupy the chief places in that kingdom. Jesus reproved them for this, and exhorted them not to imitate the ambitious pride of earthly rulers, but to be distinguished by the lowly service they rendered to others, imitating His own example.[2] Doubtless, too, He gave them to understand on this occasion that it was not He Himself who would distribute the places in the Kingdom, but God.[3] He added: "When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. Then said He unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip; and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. . . . For the things concerning me have an end. And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords, And He said unto them, It is enough." [4]

This last allusion clearly proves that Jesus expected His enemies to take Him by surprise and put Him to death treacherously. He therefore desired to take the precautions necessary to defend Himself against the hired assassin who would carry out the sinister design. This isolated instance does not in any way

[1] Piepenbring, Christologie, pp. 66–70.

[2] Luke xxii, 24–7. This text and the place it occupies are to be preferred to Mark x, 42–5: Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 160; ii, pp. 241–6; Goguel, Marc, pp. 203–5.

[3] Mark x, 40.

[4] Luke xxii, 35–6, 38

tally with the many passages in the Gospels in which Jesus is made to predict His death and resurrection. It can only have been preserved, therefore, because it is original and really historical. Accordingly it serves to rectify the contrary data, which have evidently been introduced into the primitive Gospel at a later date. We must conclude, then, that until the last moment Jesus never had any idea that He was to die for the salvation of the world. Instead of that, He desired to defend and preserve His life in view of the speedy inauguration of the Kingdom of God. Above all it is impossible that He should have foretold His death upon the cross, because He imagined that they would seek to kill Him in some other fashion. How then could He at His last repast have represented the bread He distributed as an emblem of His body destined to be sacrificed, or the wine as symbolic of His blood which would be shed? These ideas are the outcome of Christian tradition, conceived under the influence of Apostolic theology.[1]

In face of such proofs we must come to the conclusion that the best evangelical sources have but been able to record the death of Jesus at the close of His career as a simple historical fact. The *Logia*, which includes all the essential points of Jesus' teaching, does not say a word about it. Jesus therefore cannot have given any instruction on this matter, and He cannot have represented His death as the central point of the work of redemption. Were it otherwise, exact information on this subject would already have been available in the most ancient sources of the Gospels, since the death of Jesus, side by side with

[1] Pfleiderer, Urchristentum, i, pp. 462–3, 684–7; ibid., Entstehung, pp. 104–7; Holtzmann and Loisy on Luke xxii, 35–8.

His resurrection, soon became the cardinal point of the Apostolic preaching.

2. Jesus Crucified and Glorified.

After their last meal in common, Jesus and His disciples repaired to the Mount of Olives. They came to a place called Gethsemane, and the Lord said to those who were with Him: "Pray that ye enter not into temptation. And He went forward a little and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from Him. . . . When He returned, He said to them, Sleep on now, and take your rest.[1] . . . but while He yet spake, cometh Judas . . . and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. . . . Judas drew near to Jesus and kissed Him. . . . And they laid their hands on Him, and took Him. And one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear. Then the disciples forsook Him and fled."[2] Those who had seized Jesus led Him away to the high priest. . . . "And Peter followed Him afar off, even unto the palace. . . . But a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire, and looked upon him, and said, Thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth. But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. . . . And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. And he denied

[1] Mark xiv, 26, 32, 35, 41, and Luke xxii, 39–41, which is in part more original; Loisy on Mark xiv, 32–42 and parallels; Goguel, Marc, pp. 267–70.

[2] Mark xiv, 43, 45–7, 50; Luke xxii, 47, 49–50. Cf. Loisy on Mark xiv, 43–50 and parallels.

it again. And a little after, they . . . said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them; for thou art a Galilean. . . . But he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak. . . . And he went out into the porch, and the cock crew." [1]

In the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes, to put Him to death. They bound Jesus and led Him before Pilate. They accused Him, saying, "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute unto Cæsar, saying that He Himself is Christ a King." And Pilate asked Him, saying, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" Jesus answered him affirmatively. Thereupon Pilate had Him scourged, and delivered Him to the soldiers to be crucified.[2] "And the soldiers led Him away into the hall . . . and they call together the whole band. And they clothed Him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about His head, and began to salute Him, Hail, King of the Jews. They smote Him on the head with a reed . . . and bowing their knees, worshipped Him. And when they had mocked Him, they took off the purple from Him, and put His own clothes on Him, and led Him out to crucify Him." [3]

They compelled a passer-by, Simon of Cyrene, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear Jesus' cross,

[1] Luke xxii, 54–60. Some elements which are less authentic have been added to the original account. Loisy on Mark xiv, 53–72 and parallels; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, pp. 101–2; Nicolardot pp. 294–5; Goguel, Marc, pp. 273–82.

[2] Luke xxii, 66; xxiii, 1–3, 25; Mark xv, 1–3, 15. Here, again, Luke's account is the more primitive: Loisy on Mark xv, 1–15 and parallels; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, pp. 102–3; Goguel, Marc, 280–4.

[3] Mark xv, 16–20. Cf. Loisy on this passage; Holtzmann, Synoptiker, p. 103–4

and they led Him to Golgotha, where they crucified Him. "And the superscription of His accusation was written over, The King of the Jews. And with Him they crucified two thieves, the one on the right hand and the other on the left. . . . And they that passed by railed on Him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself and come down from the cross. . . . And they that were crucified with Him reviled Him. . . . And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost." [1]

As far as the sepulchre, the entombment, and the resurrection of Jesus, subsequently described in our Gospels, are concerned, they leave much to be desired from the historical point of view.[2] But the apostle Paul has preserved for us the oldest of the traditions concerning the appearances of the risen Lord, and these are very valuable and throw strong light upon the faith of Jesus' first disciples after the death of their Master. This is what he has written: "I have delivered unto you that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve . . . after that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles; and last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. For I am the least of the apostles. But . . . whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed." [3]

[1] Mark xv, 21–2, 24, 26–7, 32, 37; Loisy on Mark xv, 21–39 and parallels; Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 104; Goguel, Marc, pp. 282–90.

[2] Meyer, Die Auferstehung Christi; Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 696–798.

[3] 1 Cor. xv, 3–9, 11.

This account is very instructive, because it puts the apparition of the risen Christ to Paul on the road to Damascus on the same level as all the others. Thus they all appear to have been visions of the same kind, passing incidents, which do not imply an actual sojourn of the risen Lord among His disciples, but serve to establish His Resurrection and Ascension. These appearances of His seem to have taken place in different places and at longer or shorter intervals. They are evidently all that are known to the Early Church. According to the passage quoted, the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament were not unfamiliar with these phenomena. Moreover, the visions were seen by believers alone, and a subjective condition was therefore necessary to enable them to perceive the risen Lord. But even as Paul believed in the objective nature of the vision vouchsafed him, in the personal and direct intervention of the glorified Christ, so, assuredly, were all the other appearances conceived, the risen Lord, although spiritualized, not being wholly spirit.[1] We must not, however, forget that, according to Paul, at the time of his conversion on the road to Damascus, God revealed Jesus Christ "in him",[2] and also that the natural, earthly body cannot come to life again substantially, but only spiritually as a new body of a celestial kind.[3] Jesus declared that they who rose from the dead would be "as the angels in heaven."[4] The risen Christ, then, must at first have been perceived in this way, so that the Gospel accounts which present Him as risen again with His mortal body, and living upon earth as before His death, must have materialized later and

[1] Loisy, Synoptiques, ii, pp. 738–44.
[2] Gal. i, 16.
[3] 1 Cor. xv, 35–49.
[4] Mark xii, 25.

been inspired by the desire to uphold the reality of His resurrection the more effectively.

Although according to the most original information we possess, the visions best account for the faith of the Early Christians in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, it is moreover certain that visions in general played an important part in the Primitive Church. Paul not only presents all the appearances of the risen Lord as such,[1] but he had other visions, in which he believed he was caught up to the third heaven and into paradise.[2] He had Divine revelations that were personal to himself, and others that were common to all Christians.[3] The whole of the Revelation of John is a striking testimony to the powerful tide of phantasy-creation which swept through the Christian circles in the early days. The Acts of the Apostles contains many instances which confirm this.[4] Those who have sought to postulate the reality of the resurrection of Jesus' terrestrial body have involved themselves in difficulties that prove insurmountable, moreover, whilst the theory of visions can much more readily be defended.[5]

Accepting this theory, it is quite natural that the risen Lord, according to the most accepted tradition, should have appeared first of all to Peter.[6] It was indeed upon this disciple that Jesus had made the most profound impression. He it was who recognized

[1] Cf. Gal. i, 12, 15–16 with 1 Cor. ix, 1 and xv, 4–8.

[2] 2 Cor. xii, 1–4.

[3] Gal. ii, 2; 1 Cor. ii, 6–16; xiv.

[4] Acts ii, 1 et seq.; vii, 55 et seq.; viii, 26–40; ix, 1–9; x, 3–16, 19–21, 30, 44 et seq.; xi, 28; xii, 7–10; xiii, 2; xvi, 6 et seq.; xviii, 9–10; xix, 6–7; xx, 23; xxi, 10–11; xxii, 6 et seq.; xxiii, 11; xxvi, 12–19; xxvii, 23–4.

[5] Keim, op. cit., iii, pp. 583–90, 592–3; Schmidt, ii, pp. 404 et seq.

[6] 1 Cor. xv, 5. Cf. Luke xxiv, 33–4.

and first affirmed the Messiahship of Jesus.[1] He, again, declared that he would never abandon or deny his Master, even were he to die with Him.[2] And of all the disciples, he alone actually had the courage to follow Him to the courtyard of Caiaphas, where Jesus was to appear before the Sanhedrim.[3] He had, then, a peculiarly strong and profound attachment to his Master, and was all the more predisposed to have visions of Him. His very denial, which caused him such anguish and remorse,[4] would increase this predisposition, giving him a most ardent desire to see Jesus again, that he might atone for his unworthy lapse. And assuredly it is because Peter was the first to believe in the resurrection of Jesus that he became the head of the Early Church, as we see from the opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles.[5] If this first appearance or vision took place a few days after Jesus' death, as was probably the case, it could easily occur again with other disciples, even with a large number. For such visions are readily communicable, especially when they are enthusiastically welcomed, as in this case they naturally would be.[6] Thus it was that Peter strengthened his brethren in the faith,[7] and later came to be considered the corner-stone of the Church.[8]

Two main objections have often been raised against this theory of visions. The first of these is, that in order to have visions of the risen Lord, the disciples must have previously believed in His resurrection; and the second, that mere visions are not enough to

[1] Mark viii, 29.
[2] Mark xiv, 29, 31.
[3] Mark xiv, 54, 66 et seq.
[4] Mark xiv, 72.
[5] Cf. Luke xxii, 32.
[6] Keim, iii, pp. 591–2; Meyer, op. cit., p. 271.
[7] Luke xxii, 32.
[8] Matt. xvi, 18.

account for the steady persistence of this belief, and the fundamental change it produced in the apostles. These objections would appear to be weighty ones if we were inclined to doubt the authenticity of Jesus' predictions of His speedy return. To-day, however, we are forced to recognize that these predictions, some of which already appeared in the *Logia*, are at least partially authentic.[1] Therefore the apostles, after the first moment of bewilderment occasioned by the death of Jesus, must have remembered that He had announced His glorious return from heaven, and for that reason a belief in the resurrection of Jesus forced itself upon them, independently both of the visions and of the empty tomb, which was so long considered the indispensable starting-point of such a belief. It was during the intense excitement produced by the death of Jesus that the visions of Him would be most likely to occur.[2] And since this sufficed to awaken in the apostles an unwavering faith in the resurrection of their Master, their later conduct is readily explained. Apostolic history proves that the very core and centre of all the fervour of activity with which the early Christians were endowed, their unflinching courage and their spirit of sacrifice, was the ardent expectation of the speedy return of the Christ. This expectation dominated all their thought and coloured their whole life. Paul, who had not even known Jesus, and had no other ground for his faith than his vision of the risen Lord, affords over-

[1] Matt. xxiii, 39; xxiv, 27, 37–41, 43–51; Luke xii, 39–40, 42–46; xiii, 35; xvii, 24, 26–30. Cf. Holtzmann, Theologie, i, p. 383 et seq., 392 et seq.

[2] Hausrath, op. cit., ii, pp. 274–80; Hase, p. 595 et seq.; Weiszäcker, Das apostolische Zeitalter, 3rd ed., pp. 14–15 (translation published by Williams & Norgate).

whelming proof of the extraordinary effect that such a phenomenon may cause in a human being. But in addition to the visions, the early disciples could base their faith upon the wonderful life of their Master, which they had been able to contemplate for a fairly long period.

We see then that it is quite wrong to bring forward the objection to this theory of visions that at that rate both the Christian faith and the foundation of the Church which was its outcome, rest upon a mere illusion. Such an objection can only obtain where the conception of this theory is a false or superficial one. As an actual fact, the visions did not produce the faith of the apostles, but were produced by it. The apostolic faith definitely rests upon the profound impression made by Jesus upon His disciples during His lifetime ; this it was which led to the conviction that He was the Messiah. Their conviction had the same foundation as Jesus' own personal faith. The Master believed in His Messiahship because of the supernatural gifts with which God had endowed Him. What Jesus really was in life, then, engendered His own faith and that of His disciples, and also aroused the certain belief in His resurrection and His parousia, which are indissolubly connected. The fundamental basis of the Christian faith, therefore, is the historic personality of Jesus. And for that reason we must attach supreme importance to this, considered by itself, to the religious and moral grandeur it makes manifest. The Messiahship, the resurrection, the parousia and all the Christological claims founded upon these are but historic forms, features which are borrowed, to express this grandeur and its surpassing worth.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Superlative Value of Jesus' Gospel.

In this book, as in his other works upon Biblical subjects, the author's method has been mainly that of a historian who desires to bear witness to the truth and combat error, for he has always been governed by the conviction that truth alone can save the world, and not error, however seductive the latter may appear. On the other hand, he has never lost sight of the fact that in religious matters faith plays an essential part, and even forms the basis and foundation of all sound and vital religion. The pages that follow, therefore, will be chiefly devoted to this supremely weighty question.

The Biblical criticism of our day makes prominent the fact that traditional views concerning the authority of the Bible, based upon the acceptance of the literal inspiration of the Scriptures, will in future no longer be tenable. Among others, A. Sabatier has clearly demonstrated this, and shewn that in this respect Jesus' teaching is no exception.[1] The exposition we have already given bears out this conclusion.

[1] Sabatier, Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'Esprit, Book II.

Moreover, the history of religions, which has been studiously prosecuted from the middle of the last century, throws new light upon the matter. It teaches us that the great nations of the ancient and classical East, above all the Egyptians and Babylonians, whose civilization extends to remote ages, one after another exercised a powerful sway over the whole of Eastern Asia, even long before the existence of the Hebrew people. That nation accordingly was very strongly affected by extraneous influences, from the moral and religious point of view, and to these were added later the Persian and Greek trends, so that the religion of the Bible, instead of being the unadulterated product of a special Divine revelation, is strongly syncretic. This can even be seen, too, in doctrines of supreme importance, like Christology.[1]

What becomes, then, of the doctrine of revelation through the Scriptures? It becomes a part of the universal revelation shared by all truly devout souls. Such a proposition, difficult to establish in former times, when the historical horizon of the civilized world was extremely limited, can now be more successfully broached, on account of the great progress made in the general history of religions. In order that this simple chapter of conclusions shall not carry us too far afield in this respect, however, we must confine ourselves to two specially characteristic subjects, and we will begin with the Taoism of Laotze, brought within the reach of the general public by Grill's book, *Loatzes Buch vom höchsten Wesen und vom höchsten Gut.* We reproduce here some of his introductory remarks with respect to this Chinese collection of tenets.

[1] Piepenbring, Christologie

That Laotze was a historical personage has sometimes been doubted, but he actually did exist. He was born in 604 B.C. Of his childhood we know nothing positive, but in his riper years he was employed at the Imperial Court of China and carried out the duties of historiographer or custodian of archives. It is related that in his old age, pierced to the heart by the unhappy situation of his ill-governed country, he resigned his post and withdrew to the eastern boundaries of the empire, where he disappeared after having, at the instance of the governor of that region, committed to writing his *Tao-te-King*, an exposition of his views, and a very abstruse piece of work.

This treatise is not an undivided whole; it is, rather, a collection of maxims, ideas and reflections from the ancient Taoist school of thought. Certain modern critics say that it contains nothing else, but that is an exaggeration. From one end of it to the other, there are too many absolutely original and personal views for us to account for such a state of things without seeing behind the work a striking individuality, and this, moreover, accords with Chinese tradition, which is probably well-grounded. Grill rightly says that if we desire to comprehend all that this problem contains, we shall find that Pascal's *Pensées* affords a good example of the way in which Laotze's thoughts must have been committed to writing first of all. If the sage's disciples afterwards completed and published these in their own fashion, the form of the book can be clearly accounted for.

Let us note, too, the following points. The eighty-one chapters of the treatise, usually very brief ones, are mainly concerned with the basic principle of the

world and the system of ethics, known as *Tao*. This term is an ambiguous one. It has been translated by "path" or "course" and also by "reason", but it takes on numerous meanings, which are varied and even subtle. In any case it is intended to express the First Cause, the supreme reason or ultimate principle of all things. It has no beginning, and exists *per se*. It permeates all things, and is not itself subject to any change whatsoever. It is the power which creates and maintains all existence. We must note, too, that Laotze attributes to the direct influence of the Tao, the moral superiority of the virtuous man, that is, the *te* or virtue which is the second term in the title of the book. Tao, therefore, is the origin and source of morality, and this is why Laotze, instead of submitting rules, maxims and regulations for all possible cases which man may be called upon to decide, at all times makes the moral life depend upon the possession of Tao in the heart. The man who has this and lets himself be guided by it, fulfils all his duties spontaneously. The sage often speaks of Tao, as the foundation of all virtue, in a way that makes us think of Christian faith and love, or yet again, of the Holy Spirit, or the Greek and Johannine *Logos*. Thus Grill admirably sums up the main contents of the book, indicating by the title he gives it that it treats primarily of the Supreme Being and the Supreme Good.[1]

This scholarly writer has not only furnished a German translation of the work in question, but gives numerous notes upon each of the short chapters contained therein; and he pays due attention to all the publications on the subject by the most competent

[1] Grill, op. cit., pp. 7–14, 27–43.

experts.[1] In his introduction, too, he has ably set forth all the essential points of the treatise, referring repeatedly to the chapters dealt with, in which it is easy to find and verify these.[2] We will now proceed to give the main features of this masterly exposition.

The whole philosophy of Laotze, which is to point out the way to the supreme good, to a happy life, is based upon his idea of the Supreme Being, of the very foundation of existence and life in general. He does not find in it a personal being, and expressly states that one cannot know or express what the supreme principle of existence is. He feels able only to say what it is *not*, and to affirm that it infinitely surpasses all that man can conceive of it. Yet it is for him a vital essence, an absolute power, which thus constitutes the ultimate foundation of all things, the unique principle of all existence. This potential force does not create everything at once, but through its own activity evolves the fundamental substance of heaven and earth, which it transforms, to make of it the world we see, and thereby it manifests itself as the power which maintains and regulates the universe. Its incommensurable essence and glory are so far beyond our conception that we can but dimly contemplate them in this world, and we call our idea Tao, i.e., the primal cause, the law and purpose of the world. Tao, therefore, is the soul force of the world, which forms, quickens, and governs all things. It may also be called the Primordial Father, or the Fostermother who nourishes the whole world; especially the world of mind, for Tao constitutes the source of all human knowledge. But however resplendent it may appear in the region of

[1] Grill, op. cit., pp. 75–202. [2] Ibid., pp. 14–27.

thought, in man's intellectual endowments, its real and profound essence can only be fully appreciated when it is recognized as the Final Cause of the moral order of the universe, which makes even evil things conspire together for good. This feature of it is the one in which the philosopher discerns the highest grandeur of the Supreme Being. In it he beholds the primordial type of all morality, for the loftiest thing on earth desires to be the least apparent; it is in fact a proof of the most perfect disinterestedness, which claims nothing for itself, and yet never ceases to consecrate itself to the service of the world.

The significance of these enthusiastic statements made by Laotze concerning the boundless "love" of Tao (sometimes called the Heaven), are revealed above all in those which depict its beneficent influence upon the human heart. For by means of this stripping of self, in which the true grandeur of Tao is seen, it becomes not only the loftiest and purest model of human virtue and wisdom, but also the most vitalizing principle of moral regeneration and salvation. For humanity is essentially in need of a regeneration within, man in general no longer being what he might be and ought to be by virtue of his original relationship to Tao. It is above all to be deplored that he no longer possesses the essential features of its spiritual grandeur: the humility, absence of pretension and of malice, which recall the characteristics of childhood. His inner self is even governed by the vice of covetousness, which makes an egotist of him and involves him in ambition and vanity, in the perpetual search after material benefits and sensual pleasures, leading him even to fraud and violence to attain his ends. The power of the senses,

bad example, and public customs are no excuse for men, because each one by virtue of his origin is possessed of Tao, and thus has strength of will. If he sins, he abuses his moral liberty and is false both to the Supreme Being and to his better self. Although all men have thus lapsed, and their downfall is very grave, the human species has not irrevocably lost the powers of its higher nature. From all ages there have been human beings who participated in the qualities of Tao, just as the good and bad have always been opposed to each other, and salvation is only to be found in a return to a childlike state, which implies a return to Tao. The world of humanity can only revert to its normal state by an influence from within. To attain this, a man must not avoid the impressions made by Tao, but yield to them ; he must note the beneficial testimony to Tao afforded by others, and allow himself to be guided in the right path ; finally, he must recognize that Tao is to be cherished, that it is indeed the supreme good, and take cognizance that he himself is the child of Tao. A single change is not enough to ensure salvation ; the conversion must be renewed again and again. Since throughout his whole life man is subjected to a moral conflict, the result of which decides his future fate, he must daily seek Tao, that he may be fully imbued with it, may be delivered from the burden of his guilt and finally attain salvation. To the duty of holding fast to Tao in all his actions, so that it may fortify him and stimulate him to advance in morality, he must add that of setting it forth in such a way as to prove an example to others. In all his efforts and throughout his struggle, man finds that Tao is a saving grace, a watchful providence which takes into account the

need of salvation for all. Tao helps each individual from the very beginning of his life, and later assists him to make continual progress. It even tries to save the wicked from perdition, yet it respects our liberty, and none is forced to submit to amelioration that he may be finally saved. He who disregards this way of salvation and yields to his evil passions accomplishes his own ruin ; he bears within himself not only the seeds of physical death, but is spiritually dead while yet alive. For him, Tao will be the supreme judge, and his punishment will be everlasting death. The true disciple of Tao, on the contrary, receives abundant blessings ; his moral nature becomes ever more enlightened, purified and strengthened. He is the truly wise man, and the chief aim of the *Tao-te-King* is to make this evident.

We see how far-reaching and at the same time how lofty is Laotze's point of view. His optimism and his faith enable him to present to his contemporaries, and leave for posterity, an ideal picture of the sage who puts his principles into practice, even at the risk of being neither comprehended nor followed. He regards the man in whom the will towards good, inspired by Tao, has become second nature, as the very highest example of wisdom and virtue. At the same time we should note the moderation of this ideal compared with that of Confucianism. It is dominated by the principle that we should aim at personal self-effacement, and not desire to play a prominent part. This selflessness is closely related to the Taoist idea, it is " the way of Tao ", and the way of salvation. The picture drawn by Laotze of the moral well-being which the wise man enjoys exhibits the following features. He is and remains

a worshipper of Tao. He does not stop short at the lower degrees of morality, which follow one another in an ascending scale: propriety of behaviour, adherence to law, humanity, morality ; but he aspires to a yet higher degree, to saintliness, which is the Taoist ideal, the only true virtue, needful to the soul. Thus he acts in accordance with the eternal order of things and fulfils his life's true destiny. This does not mean that the sage is to pass his days in a state of asceticism contrary to nature, but he must learn to enjoy dispassionately. He does not give way to enfeebling sensualism, but makes his inner life his guide ; his aspirations are not for material advantages, but for moral benefits. He does not aim at the enjoyment of life, as if that were the highest good. He is no opportunist, but rather resembles the water which is at the service of all and seeks by preference the lowliest depths, in which it is like unto Tao. In aiming at an exalted position, the wise man would fear that he was betraying Tao. If he accomplishes some good thing, he does it unassumingly and modestly, and if he has acquired merit, he keeps his personality in the background. He does not aspire to profound scholarship, but desires the knowledge of himself, which keeps him humble. In the main, the sage is a man who is truly enlightened, and knows how to handle his task. The absence of greed in him, which opens his eyes to the blessings which are real, gives him the power of surveying the profoundest mysteries of the world. The liberty of soul he acquires is the result of his moral influence over the self within him, and while striving to develop his inner life, akin to that of Tao, he finds ample compensation for the sacrifice of material gains. Thereby

he proves that he is both a wise man and a hero; and at the same time he attains to the inestimable blessing of absolute peace of mind, which recalls the simple, care-free attitude of a child. Since he has embraced Taoist principles and perseveres in them he need have no fear of death, which has no power over him. Perseverance in well-doing gives the positive assurance of eternal life, for when, like the Heaven and the Earth, one does not exist for one's own ends, one acquires life which shall endure.

If the sage is guided by Tao in his dealings with himself, it is the same with regard to others: in the bosom of his family, his dwelling-place, his country, and the Empire. From the very first he grounds his own family life upon a solid basis of morality and upright behaviour. If his task be to instruct others concerning Tao, he is conscious that he derives his knowledge from Tao itself, and he expounds it with the authority of Tao. Should his hearers not desire to comprehend or accept his message, he retains his treasure of wisdom for himself. The basis of Laotze's doctrine is the truth that Tao leads to a different estimate of values from that of current opinion, and sets moral principles and a moral life above aught else. The sage's most important task is to exert a beneficial influence on others by force of his good example. The more he is actuated by the spirit of Tao, not seeking his own interest but renouncing the claims of self, the more will he prove a shining example to well-disposed souls. Mindful above all of his own shortcomings, he is able to judge others fairly. Since he does good for the love of it and not for his own interest, he makes no difference between the good and the wicked, in this respect resembling the Heaven

and the Earth. To malicious deeds he responds with kindliness, he recompenses any injury he suffers with benefits, and returns sincerity for false dealing. His is the sacred task of saving souls by his words and deeds, and in all things he must follow the example of Tao, which does naught that is insincere. Influence that is spontaneous has ever the most effect upon others. When the sage desires to bear witness to the most profound truth and win disciples, he takes care not to say too much, nor try to impress others by a pathos which is forced. The true Taoist teacher is both moderate and circumspect, and disputation is contrary to his disposition.

The obligations incumbent upon the sage are very weighty, especially if he is the head of a State, or engaged in some other public capacity. He cannot carry through his arduous duties unless he constantly seeks strength from Tao, since the art of governing is the "service of Heaven." Princes and all who govern, above all the Emperor, must preserve Tao, and in their official duties they must work for the amelioration and the salvation of their fellow-citizens. This will not be possible unless they themselves are continually progressing in Taoist principles. The fundamental obligation of all rulers and officials is to furnish a good example in character, word and deed. To the people at large they should stand for an archetype of Tao. The Emperor must be the ideal sage, the most thorough representative of the Empire. The wisdom of Tao is irreconcilable with the egotism of rulers who abuse their influence and authority to satisfy their own ambitions. The sage does not aim at securing the favour of superiors, or an exalted position, but rather regards these as dangerous. By

the very fact, however, that he keeps modestly in the background, he may become one of the most influential among the able men. Even when seated upon the throne the sage does not desire to shine personally, but rather to resemble a simple citizen. He does not consider anything he does for the Empire as meritorious, well aware as he is that he owes it to Tao. The sovereign who is guided by Tao regards himself as the chief servant of the State, and is actuated purely by love for his people. For each citizen he has the same fatherly feeling, and he treats him accordingly.

A wise statesman occupying the highest position of all recoils in horror from the idea of employing armed force against a foreign power to attain some ambitious end, which is contrary to the spirit of Tao, and can never be productive of permanent results. He proceeds to the very last extremity to avoid war, and considers an offensive war, lightly undertaken, as a particularly abominable crime. Neither does he lead his people into a war of conquest for the purpose of strengthening his position. Necessity alone decides his part in the struggle, and if war should prove inevitable, he endeavours to lessen its evils by striking his blow rapidly and decisively. His great desire is for tranquillity and peace, not for admiration and glory. It is only a feeling for humanity, which abhors bloodshed, that can arouse him to take action for the safety of the Empire.

* * * * *

Many and striking are the parallels which might be drawn between this Chinese treatise and the Bible, between the ideas of the Supreme Being and moral

principles contained in both. In the Old Testament, the Psalms, the prophetical books and the books of instruction contain matter which is valuable in this respect. The Jewish "Wisdom" referred to in the Proverbs corresponds to some extent with Tao. These reflections are called forth by Grill, who ends his exposition by quoting eighty-one parallels between the *Tao-te-King* and the New Testament.[1] Clearly the latter contains many other texts which might appropriately be quoted, but of the number given here, sixty-seven are derived solely from Matthew's Gospel and the Johannine Scriptures. This is evidently due to the fact that Grill desired above all to establish a comparison between Jesus and Laotze, as we shall see from his preface, which seems also to be his concluding word.

There is clearly a spiritual kinship between Laotze and Jesus, particularly as both have recognized the Supreme Being as at once the primordial type of good and the perfect example of the moral life, imputing to it love for all alike. Both have found that disinterested love must also guide a man's conduct towards his neighbour, and even lead him to return good for evil. It is a noteworthy fact that Laotze conceived this idea six centuries before the

[1] These are the passages in question: Matt. v, 3, 43–8; vi, 1–8, 16–19, 22–3, 25 et seq.; vii, 6–7, 12–14; x, 28; xi, 25–30; xiii, 3–8, 11, 13, 52; xvi, 25–6; xviii, 3–4, 7; xx, 16, 26; xxiii, 11–12; Luke ix, 54–6; John i, 10–11; iii, 34; iv, 14; v, 17, 19, 24, 30; vi, 27, 45; vii, 16–17; viii, 21, 24, 28; ix, 41; x, 28, 32, 37; xi, 25–6; xii, 25, 49–50; xiv, 6; xvii, 1–2; 1 John iii, 14; iv, 16 et seq.; v, 3; 1 Cor. i, 25 et seq.; iv, 11–12; vii, 30–1; xii, 31; 2 Cor. xii, 9–10; Rom. vi, 23; vii, 5, 10; viii, 14; xii, 21; Phil. iv, 11–12; Acts xvii, 25, 27–8; 2 Tim. iii, 7. The chapters of *Tao-te-King* which correspond with these are indicated in Grill's book on p. 203, etc.

Christian era, and in this he proved superior to the most prominent men of antiquity, comprising, besides the Israelitish prophets, such thinkers as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Nowhere, and in Israel least of all, had men any thought of extending the love of one's neighbour to love of one's enemy. The Buddhist teaching, too, left much to be desired where brotherly love was concerned; its love was too passive, being no more than pity, which has done little to alleviate the woes of humanity, for in that creed personal, and not universal, salvation was the paramount aim. Laotze, therefore, is one of the most outstanding figures in the spiritual history of mankind, and he has expressed views which deserve the serious consideration of all ages.[1]

These remarks are by no means exaggerated. As a matter of fact we have seen that Laotze's treatise contains the fundamental points of all sound morality: it establishes the necessity of regeneration for everyone; it grants the paramount importance of self-renunciation; it most of all resists selfishness and ambition, the springs of all vice; it accentuates the supreme need of humility for all men and, like Jesus' own act, it takes a child as the pattern to be imitated. Yet more, its system is profoundly religious, since it makes Tao, the essential principle of the world, the source of all morality. The great superiority of the system, moreover, is its universalism, which has the merit of improving upon the Scriptural exclusiveness, according to which the Spirit of God exercises a healing and life-giving influence in Israel and in the Christian Church alone, a conception which the modern world clearly conceives to be a narrow-minded view.

[1] Grill, op. cit., chap. vi–xii.

This particularism is expressed again in the Pauline and Johannine doctrines, and there it is yet more exaggerated since, according to their tenets, every man in his fallen state is but a carnal being, and to obtain God's grace and the Holy Spirit he must be counted among the elect. Laotze, too, admits the fall of man, but not his total depravity, and this assuredly is only right, and in conformity with Jesus' conception. Laotze expressly states that Tao operates in all men.

Another remarkable feature is, that at a time when ritualism was everywhere regarded as of supreme importance (and this, too, in Israel) the sage avowed that if man were to regain his normal state and attain eternal life an inner, spiritual and, to some extent, mystical influence was above all necessary, and that this influence mainly consisted in the possession of Tao and its energizing effect upon human conduct. This point is all the more significant because Confucius, a youthful contemporary of Laotze, and himself a Chinese reformer, attached great importance to the ritual practices of religion. In this connection Laotze has more in common with the great prophets of Israel and with Jesus, who, in emphasizing the importance of morality in life and conduct, have thereby displayed a truly universalist tendency. In Jesus' case, this is most clearly seen in the statements in which he contrasts the centurion at Capernaum, the Ninevites, and the Queen of the South with the impenitent Jews.

The chief omission to be noted in Laotze is that he takes no account of sinners who repent of their sins and feel a strong desire for pardon. On this point the Gospel of Jesus is immeasurably superior. *Tao-*

te-King, in general, appeals to calm reason and reflection, not enough to the heart and emotions, which nevertheless with most men bear a significant part in the sphere of religion and morals. Again, how great is the distance which separates the abstraction called Tao from the Father in Heaven of the Gospels! On one occasion, in passing, the sage bestows on Tao the name of Father and of Mother, but only to shew it as the creative essence of the world. And this supreme principle never manifests any paternal or maternal feeling for men, who are nowhere spoken of as the children of God. Here we have a very serious omission, especially from the moral point of view, for man, when pardoned and conscious of being the child of a God of Love, feels the need of responding to such love by returning it in kind, and by consecrating his life to God. This affords a powerful moral stimulus, which is wholly lacking in Laotze's doctrine.

Nor has Tao the majesty of the Thrice Holy God of the great prophets of Israel, before Whom unworthy and feeble man feels the need to prostrate himself, in the consciousness of his insignificance and inferiority. This lifeless and abstract principle has none of the compassionate love and tenderness of the Heavenly Father towards the humble and contrite sinner who is tormented by an urgent need of grace and pardon. The idea of the kingship of God can never be found in the *Tao-te-King* either, nor the need of the sacrifices which must be made for the glory of God. The sentiment of the brotherly love of humanity is not distinctly affirmed in it; its horizon hardly extends beyond the Chinese Empire. We must not forget, however, that Hebraism, Judaism, and Christianity were all distinguished for their exclusiveness.

2. The Superiority of Christianity; the Stoic Ideals.

From the striking comparison just drawn between the teaching of Jesus and the doctrine of Laotze, we proceed to a second, which places Christianity side by side with the principles held by the Stoics. Here too, as in the previous instance, we are guided by a noteworthy monograph, the work of Bonhoeffer, which appeared in 1911, a year after Grill's treatise. This work is entitled *Epiktet und das Neue Testament.* People have always been impressed by the lofty standards of Epictetus' doctrine and the many resemblances between it and certain New Testament precepts, and among those who are dominated by the conservative idea that in the Bible alone pure doctrine is to be found, there is a continual tendency to attribute the great truths expounded by Epictetus to the Christian influence, as was often the case, too, with Seneca's high ideals. But this is pure conjecture, and not borne out by facts. In modern times certain of the critics have gone to the opposite extreme, trying to discover in the New Testament much more extraneous, and especially Stoic, influence than there really is. Bonhoeffer aims at correcting the errors and exaggerations of both parties. He devotes himself to a thoroughly circumstantial investigation of the language of Epictetus, comparing it with that of the New Testament, so that the most striking parallels of the two doctrines may at once be noted. Upon the solid foundation thus laid he constructs an excellent comparison, not only between Epictetus' doctrine and the New Testament, but also between Stoicism and Christianity in general,[1] and it is the

[1] Bonhoeffer, op. cit., pp. 339–90.

main contents of these exceptionally valuable pages that we are about to reproduce here.

The first outstanding point with regard to the really pure Stoicism is its truly religious character, and this it is which permits of a close comparison with Christianity. The former attributes to the Divinity a wise and fatherly care, and a heart full of love to men, but hating evil. One lasting proof of Divine justice lies in the fact that vice never fails to bring its own punishment. Substituted for the Divine grace which, according to the Christian, grants pardon for sin, we have a belief in the essential goodness of God, and in the possibility that man can amend his ways and arrive at salvation here below. This is a religious point of view, since it shews human nature to be derived from God. It knows naught, indeed, of any special revelation of God, but the tradition of the great Stoics takes the place of this, and affords the certainty of knowing the truth and the way of salvation. In so far as the Stoic religiousness approximates the Christian theism, it, too, attains a real and living union of religion and morals, of faith and practice. The entire ethical code of the Stoics rests in fact upon the belief in the existence of a God whose nature is sheer goodness and moral perfection, constituting the supreme law for men, who are in spirit like unto God. It follows therefore, that a life consistent with goodness and the moral law is in accordance with the Divine will and may rely upon Divine approval. Nevertheless, that which prevents Stoic piety from being as worthy of esteem as Christian piety is its pantheistic tendency (which is seen, too, in Epictetus), for this is an obstacle to gratitude towards God, and sincere relations between

God and man. Both trends are exclusive, and condemn any religion but their own.

A second point, dependent on the preceding one, and permitting of a comparison between the Stoicism of Epictetus and the Christianity of the New Testament, is the conception of life as fundamentally joyous and happy, held by the first. How could man fail to be happy when convinced that he is possessed of absolute truth and saved from all the ills of life and death? But the joy of the Christian rests upon the hope of future salvation, whilst the follower of Epictetus is in full enjoyment of it in the present and believes it to be within the reach of everybody, by virtue of the general ordering of the world and of human nature. This difference between the two points of view must not be carried too far, however, since eternal life cannot be a matter of experience here on earth. We should add, too, that even if the first Christians did not accentuate a present salvation, the author of the Fourth Gospel does. Moreover, a man's private inclinations depend above all upon the value he sets upon his present life.

The optimistic views expressed by Epictetus, and found in the New Testament also, presuppose an entirely idealistic conception of the world and of life. This is the third characteristic common to both systems. He whose heart is set upon the good things of this world, whatever their nature, cannot possess the joy of which we have just spoken, for he is too much exposed to disappointment. There is hardly any matter upon which Epictetus and the New Testament writers are more fully agreed than this, both scorning earthly possessions and rising superior

to the misfortunes of this world. Herein lies the "apathy" of the Stoic. He can moreover adjust himself more easily to certain pleasures of life than the Christian, who finds danger even in innocent joys, because primitive Christianity had a very pronounced dualistic and ascetic tendency. These differences do not impair the fundamental concord between the two systems, since each attributes the greater importance to the inner life of the spirit, untouched by influences from outside, whether pleasurable or painful.

This serious idealistic side of life can be seen, not only in the theoretical conception of the world, but also in the obligations imposed upon a man who desires to enjoy a happiness which is independent of external influences; his serious ideal must lead to serious morality. He must actually overcome the world in order to be happy, and he must himself be inwardly detached from it, for it is impossible to acquire worldly possessions and true happiness at the same time, or to reconcile the love of the world with the love of God. This is the fourth point in which the teaching of Epictetus and the New Testament approximate very closely. The former contains wonderful passages which set forth this truth in an appropriate and impressive way. In his writings are to be found exhortations quite as insistent as those of Jesus, about the choice which must be made between the two courses; in morals and in dogma he is inexorable. This intransigent attitude is modified here and there by the argument that man need never despair of salvation, that he may be converted "at the eleventh hour." In both, too, there is insistence upon the necessity of being faithful in all

things, even in the very smallest. We must add that Epictetus' doctrine is distinguished for its pronounced unity and simplicity. If the same cannot be said of the New Testament, it is because the Gospel of Jesus has passed through so many different spheres of influence. The Gospel itself is simple, like all that is truly great. Both its fundamental conception and that of Epictetus lend themselves to varied developments embracing human life in its entirety.

Naturally there are important differences between the two doctrines. Thus Stoicism is essentially a philosophy, founded upon reason, and not, like Christianity, a religion, having faith for its foundation and groundwork. Another important difference is that Stoicism relates to this world only, and considers death natural, whilst Christianity views it as the curse laid upon sin. The Christian, therefore, finds true happiness only in the hope of eternal life, whilst the Stoic must find it in the faithful accomplishment of the task assigned him in this world. Hence there is a certain self-sufficiency in the Stoic, which contrasts with the humility enjoined upon Christians. It is quite unjust, however, to identify this with the pride of the Pharisees, as has been done, for Epictetus was truly humble, and many Christians are lacking in true humility. Those who share the lofty ideals of Jesus and of Epictetus are protected from pride. It is equally unjust to accuse Stoicism of having failed in altruism ; we might just as well reproach Christianity for having favoured egotism. And if one thinks the former system inconsistent with human nature, one can say the same about Christianity. On the other hand, Stoicism is better able to appraise

the good things of this world than Jesus, and the disciples who were really faithful to His teaching.

* * * * *

After these general comparisons let us consider certain special points, and first of all the idea of God. Epictetus and other Stoics have a very lofty concept of the ethical nature of God ; their writings, like the Bible, lay stress upon His holiness, purity and goodness. In their eyes, even bad thoughts are incompatible with the idea of God's presence. He is the Dispenser of every good thing ; He provides with Fatherly care for the needs of all men. The Stoic could have said with John the Evangelist that God is love, all the more so because, in his view of it, God blesses man abundantly even in this life. But since he was guided by reason rather than by feeling, his ethical view of God was incomplete, however. He extols trust in God, love of God and communion with Him, but in him such concepts are but a faint and lukewarm reflection of the ardent glow of feeling they imply among Christians. Epictetus, like the Stoics in general, knows neither the fear nor the anger of God which still figure in the New Testament. The Stoics held that God works man no ill that he does not draw down upon himself. Stoicism has never been of a ritualistic type of religion, and herein it recalls the Gospel point of view. Epictetus does not object to prayers and sacrifices to obtain material benefits, but he shows clearly that it is spiritual good that must be sought before aught else. He has much to say about the worship of God in spirit and in truth, in the Johannine sense. The Stoics as a whole

did not reach this lofty standard, however, any more than many Christians do still.

Both Stoicism and Primitive Christianity, holding happiness to be independent of the world, were comparatively indifferent about individual existence, and cosmic and human evolution in general. This indifference did not arise from pessimism or pure negation of feeling, however, for this can only be the case when man doubts or despairs of his happiness, a state which does not occur in either of the systems we are considering. If the Stoics and the Early Christians sometimes took a somewhat pessimistic view of the world, it was due, rather, to the excessively idealistic nature of their optimism. What both lacked was a lively and active interest in the amelioration of the external conditions of life, and in the progress of human culture. Christianity, however, has been the greatest sinner in this respect, and for this its ultra-eschatological tendency is to blame. The Stoics, who troubled little or nothing about the future life which was the chief concern of the Christians, would be less inclined to neglect mundane affairs entirely. Thus we find Epictetus interests himself more in the human body and its needs, than is the case in the New Testament, because the earthly life alone affords him the opportunity of displaying the powers of humanity. In spite of his lofty elevation above the ordinary world he manifests a sound interest in mundane affairs, the progress of humanity, the development of the arts and other things of this kind. In the Primitive Church we seek in vain for this.

Epictetus' estimate of man's physical side is a much more natural one than the other. From the Christian standpoint, the human body is certainly

destined to participate in everlasting glory. But in this world it has natural appetites the legitimate rights of which the Early Church had much difficulty in recognizing; this was particularly the case with sexual desires. Epictetus, on the contrary, whilst instilling into his disciples the principle that the development of the spiritual life is the supreme task of our existence, was quite able to avoid extremes in this matter. Petty physical discomforts did not disturb the sage's serenity, because he set himself above even the great ills of life. In this respect there is much in common between his views and those of the New Testament. Both find no difficulty in reconciling the evils of this present life with the love of God, acknowledging the salutary effect such evils may have in developing the spiritual nature. One great difference between the two lies in the fact that Epictetus does not admit that men should pray to be delivered from evil, since it does not actually exist; nor does he desire man to pray to God for material blessings, and in this respect the indifferent attitude of the Stoic seems to exceed human powers.

Respecting sin and morality there is concord on some points between the two currents of thought, in spite of certain differences in principle. They differ already as to the concept of sin. To the Stoic it is not a conscious transgression of the Divine will, but an unconscious wandering from the right way. Epictetus is constantly repeating that ignorance leads men to seek for happiness in the wrong course, and even the greatest crimes seem to him to be the result of an error of judgment. Therefore in his writings there is no trace of any idea that God is offended or angered by sin, and that it entails the

damnation of the guilty. In spite of this he combats sin just as strongly as the prophets and apostles, showing that it degrades man to the level of the brute beast, whilst virtue preserves intercourse with God. The sage often states that he who strays into the paths of vice is more to be pitied than a blind man, and this reminds us of Jesus' actions in cases where He shewed Himself compassionate towards the greatest sinners.

Like Jesus, Epictetus administers very scathing rebuke to certain guilty people, and although he thinks that a man can always change his way of life, he nevertheless speaks of a state of callous obduracy that makes amendment very difficult, which reminds us of Jesus' words about the sin against the Holy Ghost. To both, all sin appears to be very grave, but not only does Epictetus ignore the terror which sin, through fear of the Divine anger, must inspire ; he says nothing, either, of the contrition and repentance which result in bitter tears and humble prayers for grace and pardon, or of the blissful satisfaction of pardon granted. He does not recognize that sin creates any situation between God and man, but in man alone, and though it results in inward grief, it does not touch the deeps of the soul. This grief, however, must not obtain the upper hand or lead to distress, but must entail a change of conduct.

Opposed to the idea of sin, there is naturally a corresponding idea of virtue and morality. The pure and exalted moral ideal conceived by the Stoics has not been surpassed by the Christians. It would be difficult to find one feature of Christian perfection in the New Testament which has not been conceived

by Epictetus as an essential factor of morality. He not only enforced the ancient virtues of the Greek philosophers: justice, temperance, piety, sympathy with the public good, but added to them the virtues which have become Christian traits: chastity, purity of heart, kindness, compassion, a love which pardons and succours. Both Stoics and Christians were agreed in thinking that the most insignificant actions should be judged from the moral standpoint, and this does away with the idea that there are acts of morality which are optional and specially meritorious.

We have now to consider the question of human fellowship. It has often been maintained that the Stoic, by virtue of his self-discipline, can do without the moral support of other men. It is true that such a principle may help him to be sufficient unto himself, and to submit to a life of solitude in case of need. But Epictetus also lays stress upon the necessity of cultivating friendly human relations. Stoicism in general did a great deal towards breaking down the ancient Greek exclusiveness and substituting for it cosmopolitan sentiments which embraced all humanity. Epictetus even envisaged an ideal humanity, more and more imbued with the Logos, and constituting but one mundane city governed by the will of God. The Stoics also took far more interest in human development from the ethical and intellectual standpoint than did the Early Christians, who were expecting the near approach of the end of the world, and with it a new era in which the Kingdom of God should be established. Epictetus was interested in human society to such an extent as to have spoken of the duty of continuing the race by marriage, while Jesus and Paul spoke and acted in

the contrary sense. He was equally desirous that each member of society should undertake some useful work and fulfil his duties to the state, a matter which the Early Christians often overlooked, engaged as they were with the prospect of becoming heavenly citizens. In one point the Christians surpassed the Stoics, and this was their assiduity in works of brotherly love, although their philanthropic efforts still left much to be desired. Neither party had any idea of abolishing slavery.

All this goes to prove that the spiritual importance of Stoicism borders closely upon that of Christianity. Theoretically, both the Platonic and Aristotelian ideals exceed those of the Stoics, but the latter united the thought of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle in one whole resting upon an original and powerful conception which completed the older philosophy. The characteristic feature of this follows the same course as the religion of Jesus, for it assigns an absolute value to every human soul, by virtue of his being, in God and through God, independent of the world. Although this is the culminating point of Christianity, Stoicism yet reached it in its own way. It gave the human being an incomparable greatness, and its outcome was an ethical code which is but rarely attained, and has never been surpassed.

From the historical standpoint, too, Stoicism is of equal importance. At first it dominated the world of antiquity intellectually for four centuries. At a period of political disorganization and ethical and religious decadence it offered the enlightened Greeks and Romans religion in a purer form, and thus provided them with a sound basis of morality. In that way

it afterwards helped to pave the way for Christianity, not only among the educated, but also in the lower grades of society. From the beginning of the second century A.D. it began to be absorbed in Christianity. Finally, in conjunction with Platonism, it provided ideals and tenets which developed into elements of considerable importance in Christian morals and dogma, as the writings of the Christian apologists and Fathers of the Church prove. It is therefore idle to wonder why Stoicism should not have persisted throughout the ages side by side with the new religion, for as a matter of fact it does still survive in it, and may rest satisfied with its position.

Perhaps even, it may again render Christianity the signal service which it wrought in the infancy of the Church. For a long period its influence has been more or less obliterated or obscured by others which in the course of time have been exerted on the Church and on the various Christian confessions. This was the case, in the first place, with the old and important Mystery-religions, which were more easily understood by and acceptable to the boorish and ignorant masses than religious principles which are purely ethical and spiritual. There were, too, many other complicated superstitions borrowed from different spheres of influence which successively operated upon Christianity. In our own day, however, these grosser elements are always tending to lose their value in the opinion of people of culture, whom the purer and more exalted principles alone can retain within the confines of ecclesiasticism. The Stoic ideal, therefore, can and may play a new rôle, and become once more a wholesome and active leavening influence among us, shedding certain anti-

quated and obsolete elements, and, to a like extent, adapting itself to modern thought.

* * * * *

This exposition of Taoist and Stoic doctrines clearly shews that if we agree to admit Divine revelation, we can no longer limit it to the Bible, or to Judaism and Christianity; we must enlarge its scope until we arrive at the idea of a universal revelation, for there is no absolutely essential difference between Biblical and ecclesiastical teaching and the two systems in question. These are not exceptional and distinct, but form part of a similar tide of thought which has flowed throughout the whole of the civilized world from classical times down to our own day, and (like the Bible and all the Churches) includes many different elements of varying worth. We can demonstrate the truth of this from the numerous works dealing with the history of religion in general, and the literature relating thereto.[1]

Not only do such contain many significant parallels between the Bible and the ethical and religious literature of the whole world, but modern criticism also reveals clearly that the Sacred Code of both Jew and Christian has been largely influenced by the great religions of the classical East of antiquity,

[1] Bunsen, Gott in der Geschichte; The Sacred Books of the East; Leblois, Les Bibles et les Iniateurs religieux de l'humanité, ii, iii; Tiele-Söderblom, Kompendium der Religionsgeschichte, 3rd ed.; Chantepie de la Saussaye, Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte, 3rd ed.; Pfleiderer, Religionsphilosophie, 3rd ed.; ibid., Religion und Religionen; von Orelli, Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte, 2nd ed.; Hinneburg, Kultur der Gegenwart, i; Bertholet, Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch; Gressmann, Altorientalische Texte; Lehmann, Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte; Bonet-Maury, L'unité morale des religions.

8524

and this, too, as we stated at the beginning of this chapter,[1] with respect to questions which are of primary importance. Now this is a cardinal point, and it puts the finishing stroke to that Jewish and Christian particularism which has always maintained that its tenets differed so profoundly from all other religions and to such an extent that by its means alone could the salvation of the world be attained. One result of this is that henceforward true religion and morality can no longer be separated as if they belonged to different spheres. Such a standpoint was very general in the ecclesiasticism of the past, and seemed to deprive the really virtuous of any hope of salvation if they were not orthodox, and fortified by the sacraments of the Church. Now, on the contrary, the greatest religious thinkers are of opinion that true religion and morality are inseparable.[2] And to the extent that morality is general, revelation and a quickening faith must also be. Moreover, this is only in keeping with the idea of the Divine immanence, which impresses itself more and more upon modern thought, so far as this still maintains the need and claims of religion.

Another remarkable fact deserves mention here. That is the Congress of Religions, which took place in Chicago in 1893, a complete account of which has been published in French by Professor Bonet-Maury. It appears that the sittings of this Congress took place between the 11th and the 27th of September of that year, and its conferences were attended by

[1] Vide infra, p. 178.

[2] In this connection, see A. Sabatier, Esquisse d'une Philosophie de la Religion, pp. 1–135; Boutroux, Science et Religion, pp. 341–94; Loisy, La Religion; ibid., De la discipline intellectuelle; W. Monod, Vers Dieu.

hundreds and thousands of listeners of every race and tribe and of all the principal religions of the world. This was not due to mere curiosity ; a great spiritual sympathy was made manifest, despite the many differences of opinion among those who gathered there. At this congress representatives, exceptionally well qualified to expound the great religions of the civilized world, set forth in turns the essential points of the system whose spokesmen or delegates they were. The religions represented were : the Confucianism and Taoism of China ; Buddhism of Siam, Japan and the East Indies ; the Shintoism of Japan ; Brahmanism of the East Indies ; the Jainism, Brahmoism and Parseeism of these latter districts ; Indian, European and American Islamism ; and lastly the various forms of Christianity of all the churches and denominations of most of the great countries of the world.

Discussions were held, not only upon the ancient sacred books which are still the supreme authority in the spheres represented by these delegates, but also with regard to the doctrines and religious practices which originated in or were grafted upon these books, and which constitute the existing conditions of piety in these same spheres. Now in spite of the many and vast differences of opinion among all these believers, there was a truly fraternal spirit animating these conferences. In many cases there was real *rapprochement* between some whose religious opinions and customs were very far apart. How could such a thing be possible ? It was because side by side with their differences, there were also noteworthy and striking resemblances, even upon important questions, essential principles, religious,

moral and social. They were able to discover that that which divides men in religious matters may be self-evident and strike the imagination without really affecting the heart and conscience. Thus one of the consequences arising out of this discovery, and one which they did not fail to realize, was that at the heart of all ethical and religious life we must admit a Divine revelation within the reach of all truly devout souls.

The conclusion we draw for ourselves in this respect will be that Christianity is superior to all other religions and that the Bible is by far the best of the Sacred Books, but that the traditional thesis, according to which perfect truth is to be found on the one side and pure error or superstition on the other, is no longer tenable. In many respects Jesus Himself was the product of His age, and the apostles shared several of the errors of their day, which was the case, too, with the greatest prophets of Israel, as well as with all sacred writers, both Jewish and Christian. We can therefore no longer maintain, as the Churches of the past have done, that ancient exclusiveness of both Israelites and Jewish Christians which, though formerly excusable, like all displays of particularism in those times of ignorance, is wholly irreconcilable with the discoveries of modern science, which teach us that our entire world is but a fractional part of an incommensurable universe. Moreover, to maintain the erroneous position we have mentioned would be to compromise truth and raise an insurmountable barrier between the Churches and enlightened people of our own times. It would be dwarfing Divine influence to an extent that would be offensive to the new generations, which are much more intelligent

than the older ones, and it would also impede the propagation of a faith and godliness which alone can save them from unbelief.

These reflections lead to one more point. It is one which has recently been so ably treated by Monsieur F. Ménégoz in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, respecting the essence of religious life and Christian faith.[1] Therein it appears that the results of historical criticism lead finally to the conclusion that after all "there is no other authority, as far as faith is concerned, than the immortal Christ. Now His influence is merged in that of the Spirit of God working in the world. All theology ends in rendering homage to the authority of the Christ identified with the authority of the Spirit of God."[2] Hence, "What will be the nature of the support upon which Christian faith rests? It rests upon a transcendent Power which first of all emerges from the universal Spirit of humanity, and is then traceable in the divers manifestations of prophecy and finally in the work of Jesus; moreover, this Power, localized, in the mind of the Christian, in the historical and absolutely unique ministry of the Nazarene rabbi, expands in regal splendour from this initial point and by the agency of 'the Communion of Saints' spreads itself throughout the unlimited world of Spirit, Liberty and ever-creative Life. In short, the foundation of the Christian faith is the Spirit of God, bearing direct witness to our spirit, in association with its indirect influence through the immortal spirit of the prophets, of Christ and the universal Church."[3]

A noteworthy corollary of the preceding is un-

[1] Année 1922, pp. 46–8. [2] Ibid., p. 65. [3] Ibid., p. 68.

doubtedly furnished by the great Zwingli, who has till now been too little recognized, and who has already declared that all that is good, just and true in the whole of humanity, seems to him inspired of God. Here are his own words: "Do not let us apply the term philosophic to that which is Divine and religious. Truth is not the product of philosophers' meditations, but wherever it manifests itself it comes from God. In this sense all writings that reveal truth, purity, justice and charity are sacred. If we find something good and true in Plato and Pythagoras, we may rest assured that it comes from a Divine source and we shall not seek to know who said it, but what it is that has been said. We accept the truth, even if uttered by Pagans, knowing that all truth comes from God, the sole and supreme Revealer. Everything that is true, holy, incontestable, I consider Divine, for God alone is holy and infallible. He who utters the truth, does it through God, and he who with his intellect raises himself from the contemplation of that which is visible to the invisible Divinity, can alone do so under the inspiration derived from God."[1]

Why does Zwingli differ in this respect from all the other reformers of the sixteenth century? It is not only because he, more than they, studied the writings of the old Greek philosophers, as some have thought, but also because he alone has grasped the Gospel of the historical Jesus. We know that Luther, entirely under the influence of Pauline and Johannine theology, was somewhat neglectful of the Synoptic Gospels, and, as a consequence, of the Jesus

[1] Rabaud, Histoire de la doctrine de l'inspiration des Saintes Ecritures, pp. 45–6.

of history. Zwingli, on the contrary, from the very beginning of his career as a reformer, was strongly influenced by this aspect of Him. He began his career in Zurich by expounding from the pulpit the whole of Matthew's Gospel. Thus he was straightway brought face to face with Jesus' humanism, till then too frequently lost sight of, and he must have been struck by the statements in which the Lord compares the centurion of Capernaum, the Canaanitish woman, the people of Tyre, Sodom and Gomorrah, the men of Nineveh, the Queen of the South, and also the Good Samaritan,[1] with the impenitent and blameworthy Jews. With his usual acumen Zwingli could not fail to note the affinity between Jesus and the sages of antiquity, seeing that on both sides the spiritual worth of men is not judged by their worship or their profession of faith, but by their sentiments and the morality of their conduct. It is therefore natural that this reformer should also have been led to the conviction, which he alone among reformers held, that the upright heathen would not be debarred from salvation.[2]

[1] Matt. viii, 5–13; xi, 20–4; xii, 41–2; xv, 21–8; Luke x, 25–37.

[2] Zeller, Das theologische System Zwingli's, pp. 160–65.

APPENDIX

I. The Gospels in General.

It must be clearly recognized that the two outstanding figures in the Bible—those of Moses and Jesus—have already undergone strange transformations within its pages. To-day we know that the most ancient legislation attributed to Moses does not go even so far back as the beginning of kingship in Israel, and that it contains elements from different sources; that it was extensively supplemented later by the Law of Deuteronomy elaborated in the time of Josiah and the last Jewish kings before the exile; and that other important additions were made during the exile and especially afterwards, in the time of Esdras.[1] Yet all these excrescences of varied origin and widely differing dates were indiscriminately attributed to Moses. Which of them, then, are authentic? It would be difficult to speak with absolute certainty of any single clause. All this material, originating as it does in a period long after Moses, makes us lose sight of the man himself and his work almost entirely.

The facts respecting the personality, the activities and the doctrine of Jesus are neither so difficult nor so discouraging, although they are sufficiently serious. We must remember that Our Lord did not take the

[1] Piepenbring, Histoire, pp. 212–16, 288–97, 374–401, 480–93, 553–82.

slightest step towards issuing a new Law, because He was anticipating the immediate end of the world in which He lived. His early disciples, also influenced by the same expectation, had no thought of committing to writing their own teaching and the doctrine of their Master, for they constantly anticipated the speedy return of Christ upon the clouds of heaven,[1] which would render any written Scripture wholly superfluous. Their preaching consisted mainly in preparing their listeners for this great world-event. The apostle Paul, as we see from his first Epistle to the Thessalonians and other writings, also shared this anticipation, for he was for a long time satisfied simply to preach the Gospel in his own fashion, without having recourse to written instructions. When he and others subsequently made use of this method, they very seldom, if ever, spoke of Jesus' ministry and His life on earth, confining themselves chiefly to His return in glory and the course which every man must follow, to be able to face the Supreme Judge. "Christ after the flesh" was for a long time the least concern of the early Christians in general, and not only of the apostle Paul.[2] It was not the Jesus of history and His earthly doctrine, but the risen Christ, transfigured and glorified,[3] that formed the starting-point and real content of their preaching. This dogmatic aspect of their subject subsequently influenced the preparation of all our Gospels, even the first three, very considerably.[4]

Loisy has very ably stated the points we have just advanced, and followed them up in detail. He says :

[1] Piepenbring, Jésus et les Apôtres, pp. 4–6.
[2] 2 Cor. v, 16.
[3] Piepenbring, Christologie, pp. 44–57.
[4] Holtzmann, Synoptiker, 3rd ed., pp. 20–9.

"The Gospel of Jesus was not a book, but a notification of salvation, of the speedy advent of the Divine rule that Israel was expecting. Jesus did not preach in order to leave posterity a record of His doctrine, but to win over men's minds to the hope that inspired Him with its glow. The apostles whom He had enlisted did not care, either, about collecting memoranda for history. Both Master and disciples, absorbed in their task, and persuaded that the Kingdom of Heaven was to be immediately realized, had no thought of founding their religion upon a book, or even of founding a religion. Since the Gospel continued to be preached without the glorious advent of Christ and the Kingdom being realized, Christianity came into being. People had time, and they also had need to remember what Jesus had said and done, but if it be permissible to express it thus, they remembered it to the extent and in the form demanded by the interests of the evangelizing work which had soon become, by force of circumstances, the building up of the Christian Church. To preach the Gospel according to Jesus, they had to repeat what Jesus had taught, tell of Jesus Himself, His ministry, His death and His resurrection; but they could not confine themselves to mere relation, they were obliged to substantiate the Christ and interpret the Kingdom; evangelical tradition could not exist upon recollections alone, there was a constant and progressive elaboration of the impressions and memories retained. In the course of time, for the advantage and, we may say, the necessity of Christian propaganda, this elaboration was solidified in the writings which were the instruments of apostleship." [1]

[1] Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 175.

Loisy then brings forward proofs in support of the accuracy of these preliminary statements, shewing that the first generation of Christians very largely influenced the Synoptic Gospels. We must, however, content ourselves with noting the main points of this masterly exposition.

The apostles did not begin by preaching either the story of the Christ, or any doctrinal position established by Him, or the prediction of the Heavenly Kingdom as Jesus Himself had formulated it, so greatly was the equilibrium of their first faith disturbed by the unexpected and awe-inspiring death of the preacher. When this faith was firmly re-established once more through the belief in the resurrection, it had already advanced a long way beyond the limits of Jesus' own preaching. To spread abroad such a faith, it was needful to treat of the Christ and not of the Kingdom. Instead of belief in a Kingdom which did not appear, the question at stake was belief in the Christ who had appeared. To this end it was of paramount importance to shew that Jesus, despite His death on the cross, was really the Christ. If the central point of Pauline theology is the death and resurrection of Christ, it had already become so in the previous apostolic preaching. In this as in other respects the Scripture argument was its main source. Paul explicitly represents as a traditional mark of Christianity that Christ died for our sins *according to the Scriptures*, that He was buried and rose again *according to the Scriptures*.[1] Later Jesus Himself was reputed to have repeatedly declared to His disciples that He would suffer death and would rise again according to the will of God

[1] 1 Cor. xv, 1–8.

made known by the prophets.[1] They even found in the Scriptures all sorts of details concerning the passion of Jesus; the flight of the disciples after their Master's arrest;[2] the draught of vinegar offered to the victim,[3] the division of His garments,[4] the insults of the passers-by.[5] The whole of the twenty-second Psalm seemed to be a prophecy of Jesus' death.[6] They desired to make Jesus Himself conscious of fulfilling prophecy and to shew Him pointing out beforehand the incidents of the drama of bloodshed of which He was the victim.[7]

To this influence must be added that of the nascent theology and Christology of the Early Church. This latter factor is seen in the symbolical words of the Last Supper: "This is my body", "This is my blood", emanating from the apostle Paul and signifying the redemption effected by the death of Jesus. The Pauline influence is seen, too, in what Mark relates of the obtuseness of the early disciples, especially of Peter, James and John.[8] In the story of Gethsemane the dignity of the Christ is preserved by Jesus' act of self-renunciation and submission to the will of the Father;[9] by His declaration that His arrest had been purposely arranged;[10] by the darkness that marked His agony, the rending of the veil of

[1] Mark viii, 31; ix, 31, 34 and parallels.
[2] Mark xiv, 27. Cf. Zech. xiii, 7.
[3] Mark xv, 22, 36. Cf. Ps. lxix, 22.
[4] Mark xv, 24. Cf. Ps. xxii, 19.
[5] Mark xv, 29–32; Matt. xxvii, 39–43. Cf. Ps. xxii, 8–9; cix, 25.
[6] Mark xv, 34. Cf. Ps. xxii, 2.
[7] Mark xix, 3–9, 12–16, 18, 27, 28–31.
[8] Mark iv, 10–13; vi, 52; vii, 18; viii, 21; ix, 6, 10, 19, 28, 32, 38–9; x, 24, 26–7, 35–45; xiv, 33–4, 37–40, 66–72.
[9] Mark xiv, 35–6.
[10] Mark xiv, 48–9.

the Temple and the centurion's avowal of the Saviour's real status.[1] To exploit the susceptibility of the Roman population and expedite its conversion, the apostles duplicated the trials of Jesus in order that the chief responsibility might lie with the Jewish Sanhedrim,[2] and not with Pilate. The same reason accounts for the inclusion of the story of Barabbas.[3]

If Mark, the earliest of the Synoptics, had already been strongly influenced by the views of the Apostolic Church, as we have seen, and as we can convince ourselves in detail from a study of Loisy,[4] the same was true to an even greater extent of the other two, as this critic clearly demonstrates.[5] These facts prove that the Apostolic Church never found its most urgent task to be a detailed and exact exposition of Jesus' authentic teaching. On the contrary, the fact with regard to it was similar to that we have just seen in the case of Moses and the Israel of old. Every community and every generation of Christians interpreted Jesus' doctrine according to its own peculiar needs.

2. The Primitive Elements of the Gospels.

There was this favourable circumstance, however, that Christians had begun to commit to writing the principal features of Jesus' ministry before the second fall of Jerusalem and whilst there were still in exist-

[1] Mark xv, 33, 38–9.
[2] Mark xiv, 53, 55–65. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 102.
[3] Mark xv, 6–15. Cf. Loisy, ibid., i, pp. 103 and 181.
[4] Ibid., i, pp. 175–81.
[5] Ibid., i, pp. 182–98.

ence witnesses who were fairly well-informed respecting it. We must add, too, that just as we have at last been able to distinguish between the different parts which successively entered into the composition of the Pentateuch, so we have succeeded in differentiating the stages of compilation in the Gospels and in classifying them in a chronological order of some kind. We also know, to some extent, which portions of the Gospels are more, and which less, primitive and historical.

After much tentative study undertaken by the school of history with the Gospels, as with the Pentateuch, the first important step was reached when it was recognized that the Fourth Gospel is not matter of history, but a product of Apostolic, and especially Pauline, theology, originating at the very earliest in the beginning of the second century A.D. The second and equally important step was the ascertaining that the Second Gospel was mainly the source of the other two Synoptics. The third decisive step brought the discovery that another written source, dating back beyond the second fall of Jerusalem, had helped in the composition of these latter Gospels. This was what we are accustomed to call the *Logia*, because it chiefly contains the sayings of Jesus. A fourth step was taken when it became known that Mark's Gospel is already wanting in unity, that it is very composite and includes some later portions side by side with the more primitive ones. A final result must be noted, and that is that none of our Gospels was written all at one time, but that all have been worked over, under various influences, herein resembling the Pentateuch, save that the latter collection took many centuries to

compile, whilst the successive editions of the Gospels cover a period of about one.[1]

Mark's Gospel and the *Logia* being the most ancient sources whence the life and doctrine of Jesus are drawn must first of all be considered more closely, the more so because, as historic documents, both present difficulties of all kinds. The former, which is comparatively scanty in its matter, is also badly compiled. Many of its anecdotes seem to be disconnected. Side by side with brief phrases we have a series of somewhat longer discourses forming compilations not suitable to the circumstances. There is neither historical nor chronological framework. Behind this Gospel, as in the case of those of Matthew and Luke, there must undoubtedly be certain written documents, for it really is a composition which has first been sketched out, then corrected and completed, but not by a single hand. There are in it passages which are manifestly alterations, clumsily inserted in a discourse already written.[2] The most primitive parts of the Gospel are also still recognizable.[3] To these have been added others

[1] H. Holtzmann, Die synoptischen Evangelien ; ibid, Einleitung in das neue Testament, 3rd ed., pp. 340–90, 427–75 ; ibid., Die Synoptiker, 3rd ed., pp. 1–20 ; ibid., Evangelium des Johannes, 3rd ed. ; Carpenter, op. cit. ; Julicher, Einleitung in das neue Testament, 6th ed., § 23–31 ; Wernle, Die Synoptische Frage ; ibid., Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu ; Loisy, Les Evangiles Synoptiques, i, pp. 59–202 ; ibid., Le Quatrième Evangile ; ibid., L'Evangile selon Marc ; Nicolardot, Les procédés de rédaction des trois premiers évangelistes ; Goguel, L'Evangile de Marc et ses rapports avec ceux de Matthieu et de Luc ; Dupont, Le problème synoptique.

[2] Mark iii, 22–30 ; iv, 10, 13,20 ; iv, 11–12 ; viii, 31–2 ; ix, 12–13, 31 ; x, 32–4 ; xiv, 55–65. Cf. Loisy on these passages ; ibid., L'Evangile selon Marc, pp. 15–19.

[3] These are mainly : i, 16–20, 21–7 (in part), 29–30, 40–4 ; ii, 1–5, 11–14, 16–27 ; iii, 1–5, 20–1, 31–5 ; iv, 1–9, 26–9, 33, 35–41 ;

which seem to have their origin in the *Logia*, as we shall presently see. Many of the later elements of the Gospel prove that the final editor, strongly influenced by Paulinism, aimed at producting a synthetical presentment of the Gospel which may be called Apostolic or Galilean, and the Pauline Gospel.[1]

Mark's Gospel, far from being a mere reflection of the recollections of the apostle Peter, as traditional opinion, so long in the ascendant in the Churches, would have it, has therefore been largely influenced by Paulinism. And to a like extent this Gospel, the earliest of all and the main source of the others, has even been affected by the Mystery-religions which played so important a part throughout classical antiquity, and contributed to the genesis of Paulinism first and later of other parts of the New Testament, especially the Fourth Gospel, the most recent and least historical of all, as all modern theologians are obliged to admit.[2] The most primitive and the most historical portions of Mark can alone, therefore, be laid under contribution in elaborating the life, ministry and doctrine of Jesus,[3] besides those we are about to mention.

If we were reduced to Mark's Gospel alone to help

vi, 1–6, 12–16, 30–4, 53–6 ; vii, 24–6, 27^{b}–30 ; viii, 27–9 ; ix, 1, 11, 12^{a}, 13, 30, 33^{a} ; x, 1, 13–23, 25, 32^{a} ; xi, 15–7, 27–33 ; xii, 13–31, 35–7 ; xiii, 1–4, 32 ; xiv, 1–2, 10–11, 22^{a}, 23–5, 41^{a}, 43–7, 50, 53^{a}, 54, 66–71 ; xv, 1–5, 21–2, 24^{a}, 26–7, 29–30, 32^{b}, 37. Cf. Loisy here ; ibid., L'Evangile selon Marc, pp. 19–21.

[1] Loisy, L'Evangile selon Marc, pp. 25–8. For all these preliminary questions, see, moreover, Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 84–119.

[2] J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium ; Wernle, Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu, especially pp. 55–70 ; Loisy, op. cit., i, pp. 112–19 ; ibid., L'Evangile selon Marc., pp. 29–53.

[3] In connection with what has been said on this subject, see Piepenbring's first edition of the present work, pp. 45–71.

us trace, ever so slightly and incompletely, a picture of Jesus and His ministry, we should be sadly at a loss. But, as has been stated, we still possess the *Logia*, another written source which is much more ancient and supplies us with a fairly large number of didactic passages which are the best reflection of Jesus' thought that has come down to us, together with certain features of Him and His ministry. This document was not only at the disposal of Matthew and Luke, but also of Mark.[1] Loisy thinks that the latter borrowed from it, more or less freely, the following passages: the account of John the Baptist's preaching;[2] the dispute with the Pharisees about Beelzebub;[3] the parable of the mustard-seed and other sentences inserted in the discourse on parables;[4] the summary of the instructions given to the apostles about their mission;[5] probably the words relating to that which defileth a man;[6] the reply to those who sought a sign;[7] the saying about the leaven of the Pharisees;[8] the teaching on renunciation;[9] the instructions which have been connected with the last sojourn at Capernaum;[10] the condemnation of divorce;[11] the true meaning of the apostolic office;[12] the teaching concerning faith and prayer;[13] the abridged discourse directed against the Pharisees;[14] and lastly, certain portions of His apocalyptic discourse,[15] their groundwork being undoubtedly of Jewish origin.[16]

[1] Loisy, Synoptiques, i, pp. 106, 108, 114; L'Evangile selon Marc, p. 14.

[2] Mark i, 4–15. [3] iii, 22–30. [4] iv, 21–5, 30–2.
[5] vi, 7–11. [6] vii, 2, 5, 9–12, 14–15. [7] viii, 11–12.
[8] viii, 15. [9] viii, 35, 38. [10] ix, 35, 37, 41–7, 50.
[11] x, 1–12. [12] x, 42–4. [13] xi, 22–5.
[14] xii, 38–40. [15] xiii, 9, 12, 21, 32, 33–6.
[16] xiii, 7–8, 12–20, 24–7, 30–1. Cf. Loisy, Synoptiques, i, p. 115; Marc, pp. 23–4.

We know that Matthew and Luke contain fragments from this ancient evangelical source, both more numerous and important, but of a slightly different class and tenour. We can only get a comparatively correct idea of them from earnest study and careful research, such as that of past masters like B. Weiss [1] and Harnack,[2] summarized in both cases in the works so frequently quoted by Loisy, who in knowledge and ability is no whit behind the eminent German critics. Supported by such authorities we demonstrated, in the first edition of this book, the matter derived from this source which is most assuredly authentic.[3] In accordance with the method adopted here, we merely reproduce in a footnote indications of the passages in question, and refer the reader to the first edition for their import.[4]

[1] Die Quellen des Lukas evangeliums, pp. 63–104.
[2] Sprüche und Reden Jesu.
[3] Ps. xvii–xli.
[4] Luke iii, 7–9, 16–17 = Matt. iii, 7–12.
,, iv, 1–12 = ,, iv, 1–10.
,, vi, 20–36 = ,, v, 3–12, 39–48.
,, vi, 37–42 = ,, vii, 1–5.
,, vi, 43–6 = ,, vii, 16–21; xii, 33–5.
,, vi, 47–9 = ,, vii, 24–7.
,, vii, 1–10 = ,, vii, 5–10, 13.
,, vii, 18–35 = ,, xi, 2–11, 16–19.
,, ix, 57–60 = ,, viii, 19–22.
,, x, 2 = ,, ix, 37–8.
,, xi, 3–15 = ,, x, 7–16; xi, 21–3.
,, x, 23–4 = ,, xiii, 16–17.
,, xi, 1–4 = ,, vi, 9–15.
,, xi, 9–13 = ,, vii, 7–11.
,, xi, 14–23 = ,, xii, 22–32.
,, xi, 24–6 = ,, xii, 43–5.
,, xi, 29–32 = ,, xii, 38–42.
,, xi, 33–6 = ,, v, 14–16; vi, 22–3.
,, xi, 39–52 = ,, xxiii, 4–36.
,, xii, 2–9 = ,, x, 26–33.

The Gospels include many other historic elements besides those brought forward, and these must be noted also. This task is facilitated by the results already gained. In fact, the authentic portions of Mark and of the *Logia* already referred to include a noteworthy part of the primitive Gospel. They help us to grasp the essential and characteristic features of the personality and ministry of Jesus. Starting from that point we can then discover, without much trouble or uncertainty, the other elements of the Gospels consistent with the known sources, and supplement these, following an objective method, instead of being guided in this respect by purely subjective sentiment or preconceived ideas, as has often happened since we have had to recognize that these writings are not all equally primitive and historical. Many modern commentaries contain indications of great value on this point. Here again, we are preferably guided by Loisy, who has not only laid the best of the older works under contribution, but has often completed or corrected these most

Luke xii, 22–34	=	Matt. vi, 19–21 ; 25–34.
,, xii, 39–46	=	,, xxiv, 44–51.
,, xii, 49–53	=	,, x, 34–5.
,, xii, 58–9	=	,, v, 25–6.
,, xiii, 18–21	=	,, xiii, 31–3.
,, xiii, 24–30	=	,, vii, 13–14, 22–3 ; viii, 11–12 ; xx, 16.
,, xiii, 34–5	=	,, xxiii, 37–9.
,, xiv, 16–24	=	,, xxii, 2–10.
,, xiv, 34–5	=	,, v, 13.
,, xv, 3–5	=	,, xviii, 12–14.
,, xvi, 17–18	=	,, v, 18, 32.
,, xvii, 3–4	=	,, xviii, 21–2.
,, xvii, 6	=	,, xvii, 20.
,, xvii, 26–36	=	,, xxiv, 37–41.
,, xix, 12–27	=	,, xxv, 14–30.
,, xxii, 29–30	=	,, xix, 28.

happily. We shall confine ourselves to indicating such passages in a footnote.[1]

From all this it follows that it is no longer possible to write a real biography of Jesus, nor even an account of His ministry which is fairly complete and methodical, since the Gospel of Mark, the oldest of all and the main source of the other two Synoptics, is in no sense a really chronological exposition, and betrays many serious omissions. We have moreover discovered the unmethodical and disconnected way in which portions of the *Logia* are scattered throughout the first and third Gospels. How very little their compilers seem to have troubled about history and chronology, properly so called! This is particularly the case with Matthew. His didactic portions are simply massed together, without the least attention to historical detail.[2] We see clearly, too, that certain features of the Gospel are referred to the beginning or to the end of Jesus' career according to taste. And how long did that career last? This is still a very obscure and much disputed point.[3] It seems to be certain that Jesus began His ministry before the harvest had ripened,[4] that is to say, in the spring-time; and He was doubtless put to death the following Easter, that is about a year afterwards.

In face of all this certainty, however, the real essence of the Gospel is still ours. Jesus' tenets are

[1] Matt. iv, 17; v, 20, 23–4, 29–30; xiii, 44–48; xviii, 23–35; xx, 1–15; xxi, 28–31; xxv, 1–13, in part; Luke vii, 36 et seq., 41–44, 47; ix, 61–2; x, 30–5; xi, 5–8; xii, 13–14, 16–20; xiii, 1–9, 15; xiv, 7–14, 28–32; xv, 8–23; xvii, 7–10; xviii, 2–5, 10–14; John vii, 53–viii, 11.

[2] Matt. v–vii; x; xiii; xviii; xxi, 28–xxii, 14; xxiii–xxiv.

[3] Fendt, Die Dauer der öffentlichen Wirksamkeit Jesu.

[4] Mark ii, 23.

founded on principles so simple and original that they survive all later additions and transformations. Moreover, they suffice to renew and sustain the spiritual life of all sincere souls who really thirst after God and desire to serve Him faithfully. Like the greatest prophets of ancient Israel, His chief teachers, Jesus effectually brought back the Jewish piety, which had become complicated and superficial, to certain cardinal points which are spiritual signposts for all times and all places.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of books frequently quoted in certain parts of this treatise, the name of the author and the abridged title only being given in the text.

Barbier, H. : Essai historique sur la signification primitive de la Sainte-Cène.

Bertholet, A. : Die jüdische Religion von der Zeit Esras bis zum Zeitalter Christi.

Bousset, W. : Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 2nd ed.

Carpenter, J. E. : The First Three Gospels, 4th ed.

Feine, Paul : Theologie des Neuen Testaments.

Felten, Jas. : Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.

Goguel, M. : L'Evangile de Marc et ses rapports avec ceux de Matthieu et de Luc.

L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr.

Hase, C. A. : Geschichte Jesu.[1]

Holtzmann, H. : Die Synoptiker, 3rd ed.

Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie, 2nd ed.

Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu.

Keim, C. T. : Jesu von Nazara.[2]

Krop : La pensée de Jésus sur le royaume de Dieu.

[1] A translation of this work was published in Boston in 1860.

[2] Jesus of Nazareth. Theol. Trans. Library. 1873.

Loisy, A. : Les Evangiles synoptiques.[1]

Monnier, H. : La mission historique de Jésus.

Nicolardot : Les procédés de rédaction des trois premiers évangélistes.

Piepenbring, C. : Théologie de l'Ancien Testament.

Histoire du peuple d'Israel.[2]

La christologie biblique et ses origines.

Pfleiderer, O. : Das Urchristentum, 2nd ed.[3]

Die Entstehung des Christentums.[4]

Schmidt : Die Geschichte Jesu.

Weber : System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie.

Weinel, H. : Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments.

Weiss, J. : Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes, 2nd ed.

Wernle, J. P. : Die Anfänge unserer Religion, 2nd ed.[5]

[1] Loisy's L'Evangile et l'Eglise, which is frequently quoted also, has been translated. Pitman's 1906.

[2] A translation of this work has been published in U.S.A.

[3] Primitive Christianity, in 4 vols., has been issued by the Theol. Trans. Library

[4] Christian Origins, transl. by D. A. Huebsch. Fisher Unwin 1906.

[5] The Beginnings of Christianity. Theol. Trans. Lib. 1904.

Translations are also available in the following cases :

Boutroux, Science and Religion (p. 201). Duckworth & Co., 1909.

Chantepie de la Saussaye, Lehrbuch, etc. (p. 200). Longmans 1891.

Julicher, Einleitung, etc. (p. 214). Smith, Elder, 1904.

Kittel, Scientific Study of the Old Testament (p. 123). Crown Theol. Library.

Schürer, History of the Jewish people, etc. (p. 41). 1885–1890.

Tiele-Söderblom, Kompendium, etc. (p. 200). Trübner's Oriental Series.

INDEX

Adoptionism, 123
Angelology, 85, 91, 94
Aristotle, 185, 198

Baldensperger, 118
Barbier, 130, 134, 156, 157, 158
Bertholet, 29, 44, 84, 85, 200
Beyschlag, 34, 40, 124
Bleek, 54, 66
Bonet-Maury, 200–201
Bonhoeffer, 188
Bousset, 29, 30, 42, 43, 44, 118, 119, 123, 125, 128, 129
Boutroux, 201
Brandt, 155
Bruston, 53
Bunsen, 200

Carpenter, J. E., 40, 107, 133, 214
Chantepie de la Saussaye, 200
Chapuis, 118
Chicago Congress of Religions, 201–2
Clemen, 42, 119
Colani, 126
Confucianism, 186
Coulange, 130

Dallmann, 43
Demonology, 85, 91, 94
Dupont, 214

Epictetus, *vide* Stoicism
Eschatology, 41–62, 92, 119
Essenism, 15–16, 160
Eudæmonism, 76–79
Expiation, Pauline doctrine of, 89, 163

Feine, 48, 57, 58, 67, 71, 118
Felten, 84, 85
Fendt, 219

Goguel, 101, 103, 106, 107, 108, 130, 133, 141, 143, 149, 152, 155, 156, 158, 160, 162, 164, 165, 166, 214
Gressmann, 121, 200
Grill, 173, 175, 176, 184, 185

Harnack, 43, 80, 89, 217
Hase, 21, 40, 170
Hausrath, 17, 34, 170
Heitmüller, 156, 157, 158, 159
Hinneburg, 200
Holtzmann, H., 11, 24, 28, 34, 39, 41, 42, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 67, 71, 73, 77, 84, 85, 106, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 143, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 155, 156, 163, 165, 166, 170, 208, 214
Holtzmann, O., 11, 22, 40, 48
Holtzmann and Klostermann, 42

Individualism, 160

Jeremias, 123
Julicher, 214

Keim, 11, 17, 18, 21, 30, 34, 42
Kittel, 123
Klostermann, 42
Krop, 48, 60, 64, 66, 67, 118

Laotze, 173–187
Leblois, 200
Lehmann, 200
Lobstein, 161
Logia, 163, 170, 213, 214, 216, 218, 219

Logos, 175, 197
Loisy, 5, 10, 17, 21, 25, 26, 34, 39, 41, 44, 46, 52, 57, 67, 70, 76, 80, 82, 101, 102, 103, 106, 112, 117, 119, 123, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 137, 138, 139, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 201, 209, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218
Luther, 27, 205

Meinhold, 23
Ménégoz, 204
Messiahship, 110–117, 118
Messianic titles, 117–128
Meyer, 166, 169
Meyer and Bleek, 54
Monnier, 22, 35, 40, 43, 58, 66, 71, 118, 119
Monod, 201
Mystery-religions, 199, 215

Nicolardot, 101, 103, 130, 165, 214
Norden, 125

Parousia, 171
Particularism, 48, 87, 98, 197, 201, 203
Pascal, 174
Paulinism, 73, 77, 129, 159, 210, 215
Pfleiderer, 43, 44, 109, 118, 125, 128, 130, 131, 133, 141, 156, 159, 163, 200
Piepenbring, 9, 10, 36, 45, 50, 73, 77, 80, 84, 85, 89, 103, 109, 111, 114, 120, 122, 123, 159, 160, 162, 173, 207, 208, 215
Plato, Platonism, 185, 198–9, 205
Pythagoras, 205

Rabaud, 205
Renan, 11, 66, 126
Reville, 40

Sabatier, 17, 40, 172, 201
Schenkel, 126
Schmidt, 40, 48, 168
Schürer, 41
Schweitzer, 117
Seneca, 188
Smith, 160
Socrates, 185, 198
Staffer, 11, 40
Stoicism, 188–200

Taoism, Tao-te-King, 173–187
Tiele-Söderblom, 200

Universalism, 84, 200, 204

Von Orelli, 200

Weber, 20
Weinel, 27, 28, 40, 42, 43, 44, 51, 53, 58, 63, 65, 68, 71, 73, 78, 87, 112, 118, 122, 124
Weiss, B., 40, 217
Weiss, J., 42, 43, 44, 45, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 60, 64, 66, 67, 106, 117, 118, 119, 123, 124, 128, 143, 156, 157, 215
Weizsäcker, 170
Wellhausen, 128
Wendt, 23
Wernle, 27, 28, 44, 45, 48, 49, 52, 53, 116, 214, 215
Wittichen, 54
Wrede, 43, 44

Zeller, 206
Zwingli, 205, 206

Printed in Great Britain by
UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, LONDON AND WOKING

8524
EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

DATE DUE

BT 301 .P63 1924
Piepenbring, Charles, 1840-
The historical Jesus

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BT301.P63 1924
Piepenbring, The historical Jesus /
3 0645 0005 6827 5